THEORY OF CREATION

IN MAIN ORTHODOX SCHOOLS OF INDIAN PHILOSOPHY

By

RUDRAKANTA MISHRA, M. A., D. Phil.,
Reader, Department of Sanskrit
University of Allahabad

JACL-KRC
014213
13

TIRABHUKTI PUBLICATIONS (J)
1/1-B, P. C. Banerji Road, Allahbad 211002, INDIA

4213

राष्ट्रिय संस्कृत संस्थान, जयपुर परिसर

पुस्तकालय

पुस्तक संख्या ....

वर्गीकरण संख्या ....

14213

राष्ट्रिय संस्कृत संस्थान
जयपुर परिसर, जयपुर
पुस्तकालय
क्रमांक.....

राष्ट्रिय संस्कृत संस्थान, जयपुर
परिसर

राष्ट्रिय संस्कृत संस्थान
जयपुर परिसर, जयपुर
पुस्तकालय
क्रमांक 14213

the

skrit

वर्गीकरण सं. ....

पुस्तक सं. .... दिनाङ्क......................

यह पुस्तक नीचे अङ्कित तिथि या उससे पूर्व लौटा दी जानी चाहिये। यदि पुस्तक निर्धारित तिथि से अधिक समय तक पाठक अपने पास रखेंगे तो 50 पैसे प्रतिदिन के हिसाब से विलम्ब शुल्क देय होगा।

12.2R

SV-2024

24 8
30·3 P.

THEORY OF CREATION
IN MAIN ORTHODOX SCHOOLS OF INDIAN PHILOSOPHY

By

RUDRAKANTA MISHRA, M. A., D. Phil.,
Reader, Department of Sanskrit
University of Allahabad

TIRABHUKTI PUBLICATIONS (J)
1/1-B, P. C. Banerji Road, Allahabad-211002, INDIA

© Author

Published with the assistance of Allahabad University Magazine (Research Project) award of Rs. 2,000 only.

First Edition
1992

JACL-KRC
014213

Price : Rs. 300

Printed by Milan Press, Allahabad

FOREWORD

I am glad to see that my dear pupil Dr. Rudra Kanta Mishra has at last found time to publish his work on **Theory of Creation in Main Orthodox Schools of Indian Philosophy**. It is his first major work characterised by fresh approach towards interpretation of theories.

Scholars had not seriously taken notice of the views of Pūrvamīmāṁsā on creation. Dr. Mishra has done sufficient justice to it by dealing it in detail.

He has also dared to find fault with great Vācaspati Miśra's 'unassailable logic, adduced in support of the effect being the same as its cause'. Iśvarakṛṣṇa had adduced this as the fifth and the last argument to support the theory of Satkārya.

Mention is to be made here of one more point on which the author has dared to spell out a novel path. He holds that creation is a single unitary phenomenon which has been viewed from several angles and at several stages as are suited to different types of aspirants of Truth. Thus there is no conflict amongst them.

The author has my blessings as he is not only my disciple but also the grandson of my revered Vidyāguru Mm. Dr. Umesha Mishra.

Adya Prasad Mishra

Formerly Professor and Head, Department
of Sanskrit & Vice-Chancellor
University of Allahabad

F O R E W O R D

I am glad to see that my peerless pupil Dr. Radha Kant Mishra has at last found time to publish his work on Theory of Creation in Major Orthodox Schools of Indian Philosophy. It is his first major work characterised by fresh approach towards interpretation of theories.

Scholars had not sufficiently taken notice of the views of Vijnanavadins on creation. Dr. Mishra has done sufficient justice to it by dealing it in detail.

He has also dared to find fault with great Vacaspati Misra's unassailable logic, adduced in support of the effect being the same as its cause. Likewise he has adduced the fifth and the last argument to suggest the theory of Satkarya.

Mention is to be made here of one more point on which the author has dared to spell out a novel path. He holds that creation is a single unitary phenomenon which has been viewed from several angles and at several stages as are suited to different types of aspirants of Truth. Thus there is no conflict amongst them.

The author has my blessings as he is not only my disciple but also the grandson of my revered Vidyaguru Mm. Dr. Umesha Mishra.

Adya Prasad Mishra
Formerly Professor and Head, Department
of Sanskrit & Vice-Chancellor
University of Allahabad

PREFACE

Late in 1966, and after much discussion, the subject of the present investigation was decided upon. It had the attraction of being a universally interesting topic. And yet I found that so far no systematic study of it had been attempted. In the beginning, the scope of this investigation covered all the schools of Indian Philosophy. After some time, I felt that the subject as such would be unwieldy and that the substance of Indian thought on creation would be perceptible to everyone if only the main orthodox schools were taken up.

Recently while going to the press I have come across a work entitled **Indian Theories of Creation** by Dr. K. P. Sinha, published by Chaukhambha Orientala, Varanasi in 1985 wherein an attempt was made to cover the entire subject sketchily. It has justified my decision to abandon the schools outside the mainstream of Indian thought, for, I see that it would have been hardly of any consequence to pursue them, as they hardly go beyond the traditional mainstream.

I am indebted to several erudite scholars–Mahamahopadhyaya Pandit Gopinath Kaviraj, my grandfather Mahamahopadhyaya Dr. Umesha Mishra, Dr. Siddheshwar Bhattacharya and Dr. Veeramani Prasad Upadhyaya—for their keen interest in my work and valuable suggestions.

I am obliged to my respected Guru Dr. Adya Prasad Mishra for having kindly written a foreword to this work.

Rudrakanta Mishra

CONTENTS

PAGE

FOREWORD iii

PREFACE v

CHAPTER I : INTRODUCTION 1

I The Theory of Creation 1; II The Schools of Indian Philosophy 5; III The Orthodox and Non-orthodox 7; IV The Scheme Adopted 8.

CHAPTER II : THE SAṀHITĀS 9

I Introduction 9; II The First Musings 10; III The Mechanical Theory 11; IV The Theory of 'One' Creator 13; V The Sacrificial Theory 16; VI The Tejas Theory 21; VII The Non-being Theory 25; VIII The Order or Background (Ṛta) of Creation 27; IX The Will Theory 31; X Conclusion 36.

CHAPTER III : THE UPANIṢADS 38

I Introduction 38; II The Absolute 39; III The Theory of Emanation 42; IV The Doctrine of Prāṇa 43; V The Concept of Ether 46; VI The Concept of Air 47; VII The Concept of Earth 48; VIII The Concept of Water 48; IX The Concept of Fire 50; X The Concept of Organic Nature 51; XI The Concept of Puruṣa 53; XII The Concept of Being and Non-being 54; XIII The Concept of Personal God 56; XIV The Concept of Dualism 59; XV The Concept of Time 61; XVI Conclusion 63.

CHAPTER IV : NYĀYAVAIŚEṢIKA 65

I General Background 65; II The Nyāya and the Vaiśeṣika Form One School 66; III The Uncreated Substances of the Universe 66; IV The Non-eternal Substances and the Atomic Theory Involved in Their Production 67; V Motion and its Role in Creation (both Physical and Psychic) 69; VI The Non-eternal Qualities of the Earthly Objects and the Process of Chemical Action Involved in Their Production 70; VII The Non-being and Creation 72; VIII Creation and the Nyāyavaiśeṣika Concept of Causality or Ārambha 72; IX Universal Dissolution and Creation and the Roles of God and the Law of Karman or Unseen Force Therein 75 : (A) Īśvara 76, (B) Adṛṣṭa 77, (C) Pralaya 78, (D) Sṛṣṭi 79; X The Aim of Creation 80; XI Conclusion 81.

CHAPTER V : SĀṄKHYAYOGA 83

I General Background 83; II The Prominence of 'Creation' in the Sāṅkhyayoga School 84; III The Concept of Causality (Pariṇāma) 85 : (A) A non-entity can never be brought into existence 85, (B) There is a determinate relation between the material cause and the effect 86, (C) Every effect cannot be possible from every cause 86, (D) A competent cause produces only that effect for which it is competent 86, (E) The effect is non-different from the cause 87; IV The Main Kinds of Pariṇāma 90 : (A) Dharmapariṇāma 90, (B) Lakṣaṇapariṇāma 90, (C) Avasthāpariṇāma 91; V The Concept of the Unmanifest (avyakta) and the Nature and Functioning of the Attributes that Constitute It 92; VI The Uniform Pattern of Pariṇāma During the Period of Dissolution (Pralaya) 97; VII The Purpose and Process of Creation 98; VIII The Insentient Prakṛti as the Creative Factor and its Relationship with the Puruṣa 102; IX Vijñānabhikṣu's View Refuted 103; X The Order of Creation 104; XI The Divisions of Creation 109 : (A) Pertaining to the intellect 109, (B) Pertaining to the specific objects 112, (C) Both the above divisions of creation are necessary and complementary 114, (D) Pertaining to the physical substances or gross elements (Bhautikasarga) 115; XII Conclusion 116.

CHAPTER VI : PŪRVAMĪMĀṂSĀ 119

I General Background 119; II No Universal Creation and Dissolution 121; III The Process of the Creation of the Non-eternal Realities and the Role of Unseen Force Therein 123; IV The Uncreated Eternal Realities 127; V Śakti as the Causal Energy 127; VI The Non-being and Creation 128; VII God and Creation 128; VIII Conclusion 134.

CHAPTER VII : VEDĀNTA 136

I Introduction 136; II The Śaṅkara School 137 : (A) The unqualified reality alone is the origin of creation 137, (B) The concept of causation 141, (C) The role of māyā or avidyā in creation 144, (D) The process of creation and dissolution 146; (E) The purpose of creation 149; III The Bhāskara School 150 : (A) Brahman and the concept of causation 150, (B) The order of creation 154, (C) The purpose of creation 157; IV The Rāmānuja School 158 : (A) The concept of causation 158, (B) God and Creation 159, (C) The process of creation 160, (D) The purpose of creation 162; V The Nimbārka School 163 : (A) The concept of causation 163, (B) God and Creation 165, (C) The roles of nescience and unseen force in creation 169, (D) The non-conscious realities and creation 170 : (a) Prākṛta 170, (b) Aprākṛta 171, (c) Kāla 172, (E) The process of creation 174, (F) The purpose of creation 176; VI The Mādhva School 177: (A) The concept of causation 177, (B) The process of creation and the role of God in it 179, (C) Māyā and Creation 181, (D) The external realities and creation 182, (E) The individual souls and creation 183, (F) The Periodicity of creation 184, (G) The purpose of creation 184; VII The Vāllabha School 185: (A) The concept of causation 185, (B) Brahman and the process of creation 187, (C) The purpose of creation 192; VIII Conclusion 193.

CHAPTER VIII : CONCLUSION 200

I The Concepts of Knowledge and Reality Involved in the Theory of Creation in Main Orthodox Schools of Indian Philosophy 200; II The Different Theories Being Based on the Concept of Adhikārabheda in Fact Point to the One Integral Phenomenon of Creation 202; III The Concepts of Time and Space as General Background 203; IV The Concept of the Created Universe as a Moral Stage Involving the Important Role of the Law of Karman 204; V The Concept and Role of God 206.

genesis of creation 175; (E) The purpose of creation 176; VI The Madhva School 177; (A) The concept of causation 177; (B) The process of creation and the role of God in it 179; (C) Māyā and Creation 181; (D) The external realities and creation 182; (E) The individual souls and creation 183; (F) The Periodicity of creation 184; (G) The purpose of creation 184; VII The Vallabha School 185; (A) The concept of causation 185; (B) Brahman and the process of creation 187; (C) The purpose of creation 192; VIII Conclusion 193.

CHAPTER VIII : CONCLUSION 200

I The Concept of Knowledge and Reality involved in the Theory of Creation in Both Orthodox Schools of Indian Philosophy 200; II The Different Theories Based on the Concept of Adhyāsa and Its Vital Bond to the One to Many Theory of Creation 202; III The Concept of Time and Space as General Background 203; IV The Concept of the Created Universe as a Moral Stage Involving the Important Role of the Law of Karman 204; V The Concept and Role of God 206.

1

INTRODUCTION

I. *The Theory of Creation*

It is at first necessary to define the scope of the present investigation on the theory of creation in main orthodox schools of Indian Philosophy and to describe the scheme adopted by the present writer in its treatment.

'Theory' here means conceptual knowledge gained about an object of perception or investigation. It may not often be the final or the absolute form of truth or reality, but it has still to be believed in provisionally as such (i.e., as final in its own context) by its believers or followers in order to advance further in the quest of knowledge. There also exists another meaning, besides, according to which a 'finally' established truth or general concept about that object or phenomenon is explained in a regular, consistent and systematic way being well supported according to the propounder or believer i.e., the 'theorist') either by reasoning, or by direct realisation, or by ue words of an authoritative text or individual—or by two or three of em taken together,

2 *Theory of Creation*

'Creation' can suggest any one of the following senses in the English language. To create means to "cause something new, original or different"[1]. Creation accordingly stands for :

"(1) the act of God in creating the universe as *the creation of the world.*

(2) all that God created; the world, the universe, as *the whole creation, Man is sometimes called the lord of creation.*

(3) the act of creating by man or by natural forces, conditions etc., *as the creation of great works of art* ; *the creation of a new Empire. Economic conditions are often responsible for the creation of social unrest.*

(4) the act of giving a rank to, *as the creation of peers.*

(5) a thing that is created. *The creations of the poet, the artist and the writer often bring fame without wealth. Irving's Hamlet (i. e. his performance of the part of Hamlet) was a great creation. The women were wearing the newest creations of the Paris dressmakers*".[2]

Having acquainted ourselves with the various practical uses or senses of the term 'creation' we would now examine whether and how it suits the tenets of the different schools of Indian Philosophy.

The manifold universe is caused to exist or at least appears as existing through the different happenings and changes in the phenomenal universe to almost all of us. This understanding is the starting point or general background for all the inquirers of the universal truth or reality in its various facets (e.g. those of changing or unmoved and one or many). The preachers of the different schools of Indian Philosophy have also had to explain, as intellectual and enlightened leaders of the masses, the nature of this reality in a consistent and complete or satisfactory manner according to their particular theory or angle of vision based on direct experience.[1]

---

[1] *The Advanced Learner's Dictionary of Current English* by Hornby, Gatenby and Wakefield (Oxford University Press, London, VII impression, 1956), p. 260.

[2] Ibid.

In this particular context "creation" does not necessarily mean that everything has a beginning or that something new comes to exist or is caused to exist for that matter, neither does it always stand for the act of a creator God or any other power, nor it denotes strictly the act of creating by man or natural forces, conditions etc. alone as noted above. The act of giving a rank to or a poet's or artist's creation is also not the meaning taken here. Creation should be understood in the sense of all that has been created or appears as created whether we accept a Universal Conscious Agent for that purpose or not[2], for, some of the schools do not believe in God as such. The (3), (4) and (5) meanings apparently are totally out of the context in our present study and need not even be discussed.

The basic or universally understood concept[3] of creation which presupposes that whatever exists did not exist previously has actually speaking been accepted by the Nyāyavaiśeṣikas in their *ārambhavāda* theory but not in the other schools. For example, the Sāṅkhyayoga school believes in *satkāryavāda*, i.e., 'evolutionary' creation, for although the *vikāras* or effects are due to *pariṇāma* i.e., change or activity, the apparent *sthūlabhāva* or *abhivyakti* (appearance) and *sukṣmabhāva* or *tirobhāva* (disappearance) of the particular forms assumed by the self-evolving and eternal ultimate cause viz., the *Prakṛti* or its sole constituents viz., the *guṇas*, are really responsible for the phenomenon of universal creation. Then, the *satkāraṇavāda* of the Vedānta explains the phenomenal diversity of the creation or universe as *ābhāsa* or appearance of Brahman or reality which is immutable, immanent, transcendent and absolute and hence unique in itself. Thus the basic concept of creation as referred to above (at the beginning of this paragraph) is subject to revision and difference of opinion among the philosophical schools of India.

---

[1] उपदेक्ष्यन्ति ते ज्ञानं ज्ञानिनस्तत्त्वदर्शिनः *Bhagavadgītā* 4.34. Cf. the well-known tradition ऋषयो मन्त्रद्रष्टारः ।

[2] See the meanings (1) and (2) as quoted earlier from the dictionary which are partly accepted in this definition.

[3] Sec. f. n. 1 on p. 2.

It may be recalled that the Sanskrit word *sṛṣṭi* as used in Indian Philosophy is all-comprehensive in this respect and stands for all the different shades of treatment of the phenomenon of creation. However, for want of any other suitable English word the term 'creation' has been adopted here. The concept of objects appearing as new, changing or different as aptly suggested by this term in the English usage has remained in fact the most interesting and commonly experienced phase or nature of the universe or reality which has been so sincerely, thoughtfully and eminently approached from the different standpoints or angles of vision in the various schools of Indian Philosophy.

It may be pointed out that the different schools explain creation in various ways. Creation may be defined as the production of a new form or substance due to the causal operation needing both a conscious agent and inert matter. It may be defined as the law of change or the principle working in nature that has governed the universe eternally and everywhere. It may be said that One God or Highest Soul either by Himself alone or side by side with the jīvas or worldly conscious beings shapes or manifests the inert unmoving objects, again, either out of its own being or out of some external existence or existences because of either His or their playful or selfish motives, or for the good of the jīvas according to their accumulated merits and demerits. It may also be sometimes maintained that as there is only one *nirviśeṣa sattā* or attributeless reality all appearance otherwise is illusory as in the instance of the rope appearing as serpent.

Creation may, thus, clearly be identified as the reality of or the principle working in, all the varied universe appearing differently according to the particular attitude of the 'seer' or inquirer; as for example, a skyscraping multi-storied building appears totally differently when viewed from various sides, angles or floors. A theory of creation in a school of Indian Philosophy, therefore, is in the highest sense an attempt to visualise or reduce to human intelligence or intuition the whole universe and nothing less. In the context of such an undestanding it would not be much out of the way to remark that giving a consistent explanation or theory for the universal phenomenon of creation has really been a difficult problem of paramount importance for all schools of philosophy.

At the end of this discussion it may naturally be concluded that the meaning of the term 'theory of creation' as used here includes the *asatkāryavāda* of the Nyāyavaiśeṣika, *Satkāryavāda* of the Sāṅkhyayoga, the *Satkāraṇavāda* of the Vedānta or similar other theories, by which the process of coming into being or rather 'conscious (i.e., known) existence' has been explained in the schools of Indian Philosophy.

II. The Schools of Indian Philosophy

As already pointed out there exists a wide range of difference of opinion or theory among all speculative philosophers—nay men of thought, and some of them are followed during their life-time or even later by other intellectuals who support or are guided by and contribute to the development and spread of the particular theory of the first preceptor. Thus, we have what is called the 'schools of philosophy'. In India Nyāyavaiśeṣika, Sāṅkhyayoga, Pūrvamīmāṁsā and *Uttaramīmāṁsā* or Vedānta have been the well-known main schools of philosophy. However, the apparent estrangements, oppositions and differences among schools are more marked and wide-ranging in the history of Indian thought than among ordinary thinkers or theorists individually at any one time elsewhere.

The number of schools in Indian Philosophy is not limited to six as it is alleged sometimes, because, according to the Indian viewpoint numerous individual thinkers or seers have had numerous darśanas[1] or visions of the nature of Reality or Truth, each consistently explanatory of the multitudinous diversity in the whole universe in its own respect, in all times and places.[2]

Nevertheless, the fundamental unity of aim among the various schools is clearly discernible to any sincere student of Indian Philosophy. Each system preaches a theory of reality but the darśana or intuitive perception or direct realisation of the tattva or Self or the Highest Truth, with or without any names, e.g. *ātman, śiva, brahman* and *puruṣa* et cetera ascribed to its various phases or forms according to the different standpoints in the various schools, is the final aim of each school.

The different visions or phases of the unique reality have been propounded for the benefit of different kinds of inquirers after the highest knowledge or aim of life at their respectively various levels of the ascending road of truth or spiritual experience. This fact has been most clearly brought out in Madhusūdana Sarasvatī's meaningful and memorable lines as follows :

> *na hi te munayo bhrāntāḥ sarvajñatvātteṣāṁ kintu bahirviṣayapravaṇānām āpātataḥ paramapuruṣārthe praveśo na bhavatīti nāstikyanivāraṇāya taiḥ prakaraṇabhedāḥ pradarśitāḥ*[3].

Besides the unity of aim and the apparent difference in approach[4] as pointed out above the salient features of all the orthodox schools of Indian Philosophy include their common indebtedness to the Vedic background for their ultimate origin and inspiration, the belief that every change or happening in the phenomenal universe has known or unknown cause or causes, the common belief in the efficiency of the law of karman and the theory of rebirth, and the overwhelmingly practical need of right knowledge for deliverance from miseries or the attainment of the fundamentally real and eternal bliss.

---

[1] The full meaning and significance of the use of this term in Indian thought is not completely suggested although often translated by using the nearest suitable and usual English equivalents 'Philosophy' or 'School of Philosophy'.

[2] See under the head 'varieties of *darśana*' (pp. 4 to 8) of *Conception of Matter according to Nyāyavaiśeṣika* by Mahāmahopādhyāya Dr. Umesha Mishra, Allahabad, 1936.

[3] *Prasthānabheda* as quoted in *Aspects of Indian Thought* by Mahāmahopādhyāya Dr. G. N. Kaviraj, p. 78.

[4] त्रयी सांख्यं योगः पशुपतिमतं वैष्णवमिति प्रभिन्ने प्रस्थाने परमिदमदः पथ्यमिति च । रुचीनां वैचित्र्यादृजुकुटिलनानापथजुषां नृणामेको गम्यस्त्वमसि पयसामर्णव इव ।। Puṣpadanta's *Śivamahimnaḥstotram, Verse* 7.

III. The Orthodox and the Non-orthodox

Very often according to the Indian tradition and provisionally in the absence of sufficient chronological data, the different schools of of Indian Philosophy have been divided into two groups viz., *nāstika* or non-orthodox and *āstika* or orthodox. The former, moreover, is said to consist of three main divisions viz., the Cārvāka, the Bauddha and the Jaina Schools as well as the āgamas or tantras viz., the Śaiva and the Śākta etc., while the latter mainly consists of the schools such as the Nyāyavaiśeṣika, the Sāṅkhyayoga, the Pūrvamīmāṁsā and the Vedānta.

The only great difference between the two groups is that while the orthodox schools accept the authenticity of knowledge contained in the Veda, the non-orthodox schools do not rely on them and, very often, even exclude such (Vedic) *śabda pramāṇa* from their categories of the means of right knowledge. Now, among the orthodox schools, while the Pūrvamīmāṁsā alone depends entirely on the infallible words of the Veda all other schools are agreed on the fact that in case sensual perception or reasoning falls short of explaining a problem or experience, the verdict of the ancient Veda directly or to a lesser extent even that of literature (e.g., smṛti, itihāsa et cetera) based on or developed from it during the later ages, is reliable. Thus, all orthodox schools have *śabda* or verbal testimony as one of the valid means of knowledge and thereby tend to realise the limits of sheer reason. Indeed, the various orthodox seers have time and again emphasized that the highest knowledge is not obtainable through intellectual exercise alone[1]. Thus, even the so-called school of pure logic or Nyāya prescribes the role of tarka or reasoning as only for helping or substantiating the knowledge gained by other valid means[2].

IV. The Scheme Adopted

Keeping in mind our limitations as detailed above we shall deal first of all with the unsystematized stray ideas about creation as reflected in the Saṁhitās and the Upaniṣads which together are undoubtedly accepted by tradition as the historical background for the rise and spread of the later so-called schools of Indian Philosophy. Next, will come an analytical and independent review of the different theories of creation as propounded in the main orthodox schools of Indian Philosophy one by one. In the end, we shall conclude our study by giving a synthetic view of the problem of creation in orthodox Indian Philosophy.

---

1. नैषा तर्केण मतिरापनेया यां त्वमापः सत्यधृतिर्बतासी: *Kaṭhopaniṣad* 1.2.9; तर्काप्रतिष्ठानात् *Vedāntasūtra* 2.1.11; यत्नेनानुमितोऽप्यर्थः कुशलैरनुमातृभिः अभियुक्ततरैरन्यैरन्यथैवोपपाद्यते *Vākyapadīya* 1.34; श्रद्धावाँल्लभते ज्ञानम् । *Bhagavadgītā* 4.39.
2. तर्को न प्रमाणसङ्गृहीतो. न प्रमाणान्तरम् प्रमाणानामनुग्राहकस्तत्त्वज्ञानाय कल्पते *Nyāyabhāṣya* of Vātsyāyana 1.1.1 ; Cf. the concepts of श्रवण, मनन and निदिध्यासन or 'authoritative words or texts', 'reasoning' and last but not least 'direct realization' in orthodox Indian Philosophy in the gradual process of आत्मज्ञान or 'Knowing the reality'. Cf. आत्मा वा अरे द्रष्टव्यः श्रोतव्यो मन्तव्यो निदिध्यासितव्यो मैत्रेय्यात्मनो वा अरे दर्शनेन श्रवणेन मत्या विज्ञानेनेदं सर्वं विदितम् *Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad* 2.4.5.

2

THE SAṀHITĀS

I. *Introduction*

Since the very dawn of history man has tried to solve the problem as to how all the beings and the objects of the universe first came into being and what is their true nature. It is an undeniable fact that out of the very-few-indeed literary records of earliest civilization Vedic Saṁhitās are regarded as one of the most important and ancient. Though the information regarding the Vedic social and religious life is quite numerous, abstract philosophical discussions find only stray references in them. We do not find, hence, any fully developed, detailed and systematized theory of creation anywhere. Nevertheless, the seeds of or the earliest references to, the thoughts of later Vedic (and through them of even the still later organised schools of Indian philosophy), can be found in the Saṁhitās themselves. This is why, a critical study of the Saṁhitās for finding ideas or theories of creation, howsoever simple, vague or fragmentary a a picture they might present to the modern mind, is historically important. Indeed, such a study is amply fascinating and justifiably rewarding in its revelations. It shall be our endeavour in the course of this chapter to examine the main theory or theories of creation as found in them.

II. First Musings

At the earliest and the primary stage we come across only the first questions and attempts, the most primitive beginnings of natural philosophy and theories of creation. The poets in their ignorance search with their intellect the hidden traces of the invisible, unseen gods, for their origin and deeds :

> *Who hath beheld at birth the Primal Being, seen how the boneless she supports the bony ? Where is the blood of earth, the life, the spirit ? Who may approach the man who knows, to ask it ? Unripe in mind, in spirit undiscerning, I ask of these the god's established places ; For up above the yearling calf the sages, to form a web, their own seven threads have woven !* [1]

And again, we have in the lines

> *Ye will not find him who produced these creatures ; another thing has risen up among you enwrapt in misty cloud, with lips that stammer, Hymn-chanters wonder and are discontented.*[2]

an evidence of human intellect mystified and groping in the dark unable to satisfy its curiosity and yet stammering hymns. Perhaps, the best and the most sensible as well as daring example of this spirit of uncertainty and questioning is finally found in the famous '*Song of Creation*' itself :

> *Who verily knows and who can here declare it, whence it was born and whence comes this creation ? The Gods are later than this world's production. Who knows then whence it first came into being ? He, the first origin of this creation, whether he formed it*

---

1. Ṛgveda 1.164.4,5. (Griffith's translation).
2. Ibid, 10.82.7,

> *all or did not form it, whose eye controls this world in highest heaven, he verily knows it, or perhaps he knows not.*"[1]

Such, indeed, is the ending note of one of the best pieces of writing found about the problem of creation in the Saṁhitās. Thus, simplicity and fairness of intellect are some of the most prevalent characteristics of the Vedic *Ṛṣis* ('seers') and, for the same reason, their most advanced theories, too, apparently sometimes seem lacking in firm conviction, although they are at the same time representative of the purest quests of the human heart.

III. The Mechanical[2] Theory

Creation of the universe has been metaphorically described in the form of the raising of a human building. For example. Indra, the Clever Workman,[3] is said to have scaled the six regions and formed the vast surface of the earth and the dome of the sky[4]. The act of spreading out the earth etc. which has been attributed to Agni,[5] Varuṇa[6] Viṣṇu[7] etc. also seems closely related to that of measuring. Having measured the three earthly regions Viṣṇu has solidly based his abode on a high pedastal.[8] The poles, the beams, the door cor-

---

1. *Ṛgveda* 10.129. 6 and 7.
2. The title for this section has been borrowed from Macdonell's *Vedic Mythology* pp. 11-12.
3. *Ṛgveda* 4.56.3.
4. अयं षडुर्वीरमिमीत धीरो न याम्यो भुवनं कच्चनारे ॥
   अयं स यो वरिमाणं पृथिव्या वर्ष्माणं दिवो अकृणोदयं सः ।
   अयं पीयूष तिसृषु प्रवत्सु सोमो दाधारोर्वन्तरिक्षम् ॥ Ibid, 6.47.3-4;
5. Ibid, 1.96.4; ibid, 7.5.7.
6. Ibid, 7.61.4; ibid, 5.85.5.
7. Ibid, 1.154.1-2.
8. विष्णोर्नु कं वीर्याणि प्रवोचं यः पार्थिवानि विममे रजांसि ।
   यो अस्कभायदुत्तरं सधस्थं विचक्रमाणस्त्रेधोरुगायः ॥ Ibid, 1. 154. 1.

ners, the doors, the mechanical instruments, the pegs etc.[1] have found significant mention to make this type of image of the created universe as a building complete. This theory in fact recognises the hands of Savitṛ, Bṛhaspati, Indra, Varuṇa, Vāyu and Pitṛ as co-creaters of or at least helpers of Viṣṇu or Indra as the case may be, in the act of creation.[2]

That the heavens and the earth could be formed out of wood by the devas (shining ones)[3] is also conjectured. The question has been posed as to which wood and that of what kind of tree if at all was used for the manufacture or creation of the dyāvāpṛthivī (heaven and earth).[4] Later Vedic literature probably tried to answer this question by maintaining Brahman (the Universal Spirit) as both the material and the efficient cause of creation.[5] The concept of *Puruṣa* in human form as the material cause is worth recalling here. There, too, the idea of gods as the efficient cause of creation can[6] be favourably compared to this theory and we may thus link it as an intermediate stage of development between the mechanical theory and the answer given in the later age of the Brāhmaṇas.[7]

The division of types of causes into the *samavāyi* (material) and the *nimitta* (efficient) necessary in a produce or effect was later

---

1. Macdonell's *Vedic Mythology*, *pp.* 11-12.
2. *Ṛgveda* 10.149.1, 3.38.3, 5.85.5, 1.56.5, 4.50.1, 7.99.3 etc. for the roles of *Savitṛ*, *Pitṛ*, *Varuṇa*, *Vāyu*, *Bṛhaspati* and *Indra*.
3. It is to be carefully noted that exactly this kind of polytheism in the act of creation is not entirely accepted by any one of the main orthodox schools of Indian Philosophy, although common beliefs (Cf. the myths of *Vāmana* and *Viśvakarman*, for example) continue to be largely inspired by this pure polytheism even now in the Indian society.
4. *Ṛgveda* 10.31.7; ibid, 10.81.4.
5. ब्रह्म वनं ब्रह्म स वृक्ष आसीत् (meaning that ब्रह्म was the forest, ब्रह्म was that tree from which they fashioned heaven and earth) etc. *Taittirīya Brāhmaṇa* 2.8.9.6.
6. *Ṛgveda* 10.90.
7. See f.n. 5 above.

admirably exploited by the *Nyāyavaiśeṣika* school of Indian Philosophy. The principle that the universe is composed of both *cetana* (conscious) and *jaḍa* (inert) energies or matter seems to be in the background in this theory. It affords an admirable example of how abstract problems of philosophy are explained away in the garb of ordinary human experience, here that of building a house. Just as the gods were modelled on human personality, so were the cosmic actions of the gods supposed to be only 'magnified copies of human action'.[1] Hence the image of the building of a house by different men in the context of 'creation' is understandably noteworthy.

The purpose of creation is not always mentioned though sometimes the *dyaus*, the *antarikṣa*, the *Pṛthivī*, the *Uṣas*, the *Parvatas*, the *sarits* and the *oṣadhis* or *vanspatayaḥ*, the *soma* or the *parjanya* etc. are intended for the good of men or jīvas in general, for their well-being and happiness.[2]

IV. The Theory of 'One' Creator

According to the western scholars originally the Vedic people believed in polytheism and in the existence of many gods or powers which inhabit the various forces of nature thus explaining the diverse and mysterious happenings and ways of Nature. Next came the imagination of monotheism and a chief or Lord of gods was accepted.[3] Lastly was developed their belief in the doctrine of pantheism which is evidenced in the latest hymns of the Saṁhitā such as the *puruṣasūkta*.[4]

---

[1] Wallis, *Cosmology in the Rigveda*, p. 27.

[2] *Ṛgveda* 6.49.13; ibid, 6.69.5; ibid, 1.155.4.

[3] Macdonnel's *History of Sanskrit Literature* pp. 116-118; Also *The Six systems of Indian Philosophy* by Max Muller (printed in Chowkhambha Sanskrit Studies Vol. XVI, Varanasi), pp. 39-41.

[4] *Ṛgveda* 10.90.

This view, however, sounds superficial and unimpressively forced when we consider the contents of the Vedic literature and their oriental interpretations in this connection as follows. The above doctrine is also revealed in the Taittirīya Āraṇyaka[1] where it is said that the devotees belonging to the Ṛgveda, the Yajurveda, and the Sāmaveda respectively worship the same Supreme Existence in the form of *uktha, agni* and *mahāvrata*. Thus, Yāska clearly interprets the nature of Vedic gods in *daivatakāṇḍa* :

> *mahābhāgyāt, devatāyā eka eva ātmā bahudhā stūyate-ekasyātmano'nye devāḥ pratyaṅgāni bhavanti.*
>
> (Nirukta 7. 4. 8. 9).

The gods are, thus, undoubtedly symbols of the diverse powers of only 'one' god. This theme of the One Reality is supported by *Bṛhaddevatā*.[2] They are called innumerable, lasting and vast. Thus, we can say that the greatest purpose of Ṛgveda is to describe Brahman or One transcendent and universal Being which as cause manifests into so many realities of the finite world. That the difference in the various names of gods occuring in the polytheistic 'theory' (or vision at a particular stage) of the phenomenon of creation is not real in the ultimate analysis will be evident to any reader having even a nodding acquaintance with the Saṁhitās. Again, the Ṛgveda says that prayers addressed to the various gods are in reality prayers addressed to Indra.[3] The all-pervasiveness and oneness of divinity or existence is also reflected in the Vedic concepts of *puruṣa*,[4] *aditi*, *Skambha*, and *ucchiṣṭa* etc. We shall later on deal with the all-immanent and transcedent description of *puruṣa.* Thus, it is also said that *aditi* is ether, mid-region, mother, father, son, all the gods, the five primeval clans, the born and the yet-to-be-born.[1] Similarly, the *skambha* (or basis) which is another name for *jyeṣṭha brahman* or Transcendent Reality, is said to be at the root of all existence,[2] of present, past and future,[3] and is even identified with Ātman or the soul—the essence itself which is immortal and ever young.[4]

---

[1] एतं ह्वेव बह्वृचा महत्युक्थे मीमांसन्त एतमग्नावध्वर्यव एतं महाव्रते छन्दोगाः। *Taittirīya Āraṇyaka*, 3.2.3.12.

[2] *Bṛhaddevatā* 1.61.65.

[3] *Ṛgveda* 1.7; Cf. यो यो यां यां तनुं भक्तः श्रद्धयार्चितुमिच्छति। तस्याचलां श्रद्धां तामेव विदधाम्यहम्॥ *Bhagawadgītā* 7.21.

[4] See the following section on 'The Sacrificial Theory' (vide p. 16).

The devotees of the Saṁhitā have a clear concept of a universal being, without a second who (*eko viśvasya bhuvanasya rājā sa yodhāya ca kṣayāya ca janān*) is the only ruler of the universe, who destroys the wicked and protects the good.[5] Similarly, it is said that Indra with his powers (*māyābhiḥ*) assumes various forms.[6] Indra, the One Great God, appears to us in the forms of the *āditya*, the *nakṣatras*, the *agni* and the *vāyu.*[7] Gods have been addressed in Ṛgveda as *asura.*[8] Their *asuratva* or great might or power has been recognised as one and the same.[9] As various manifest forms of the one Supreme Power or Force which sustains them, their (gods') powers or activities are not independent.[10]

1. अदितिर्द्यौरदितिरन्तरिक्षमदितिर्माता स पिता स पुत्रः ।
   विश्वे देवा अदितिः पञ्चजना अदितिर्जातमदितिर्जनित्वम् ॥ *Ṛgveda* 189.10.
2. *Atharvaveda* 10.7.12; ibid, 10.7.35.
3. Ibid, 10.8.1.
4. अकामो धीरो अमृतः स्वयम्भूः....धीरमजरं युवानम् ॥ *Atharvaveda* 10.8.44.
5. *Ṛgveda* 3.46.2 ; Cf. *Bhagawadgītā* 4.8.
6. *Ṛgveda* 6.47.18; Cf. the famous doctrine वाचारम्भणं विकारो नामधेयं मृत्तिकेत्येव सत्यम् of the *Chāndogya Upaniṣad.*
7. Ibid, 1.6.3; ibid, 1.6.1 together with *Sāyaṇabhāṣya.*
8. तद्देवस्य सवितुः असुरस्य प्रचेतसः *Ṛgveda* 4.53.1; असुर here stands for God's *śakti* or power : तदिदं देवानां एकं मुख्यं असुरत्वम् । अस्यति क्षिपति सर्वानित्यसुरः प्रबलः तस्य भावोऽसुरत्वम् प्राबल्यम् । महदैश्वर्यम् ॥ Cf. Ibid, 3.55.1 with *Sāyaṇabhāṣya,*
9. Cf. the line महद् देवानामसुरत्वमेकम् at the end of each Ṛk in *Ṛgveda* 3.55.
10. Ibid,

In this way, the Saṁhitās clearly seem to establish the absolute monistic (*advaitic*) theory of creation when it says that the all-doer (*viśvakarman*) supreme and mighty lord (*parameśvara*) merged within Himself the entire creation (during the cyclic process of dissolution after the former creation) and remained "alone" (before creation), and again, for the good of the people (the *jīvas*) He concealed His own natural (i.e., absolute monistic) form while manifesting Himself into so many created beings.[1] Thus, the Supreme Self[2]—apart from which nothing exists[3]—has been described as the Highest Resort,[4] the Highest Heaven,[5] the Fearless sight[6] etc. The above idea of the universality or oneness of Cosmic Energy (*tejas*) or Existence (*sat*) is most beautifully reflected in the monologuic narrations of their experiences and existences by the Ṛṣis *Vāmadeva*[7] and *Vāgāmbhṛṇī*.[8]

V. The Sacrificial Theory

The description of the creation of the Universe from one transcendent and immanent God (*puruṣa*)[9] as found in the *pur-*

---

1. *Ṛgveda* 10.81.1.
2. The attainment of the knowledge of this paramātman or ātman has been emphasized throughout the Vedic Literature—'तमेव विदित्वातिमृत्युमेति नान्यः पन्था विद्यतेऽयनाय' *Śvetāśvataropaniṣad* 6 15; Cf. *Atharvaveda* 31.18 and 31.21; *Ṛgveda* 1.25.11. This very line of thought later developed into 'एकेन विज्ञातेन सर्वं विज्ञातं भवति' doctrine of *Bṛhadāraṇyaka*. Cf. ibid, 2.4.5 and 4.5 6.
3. एकं सद्विप्रा बहुधा वदन्ति etc. *Ṛgveda* 1.164 46.
4. Ibid, 1.22.20; ibid, 1.22.21.
5. Ibid, 1.143.2.
6. Ibid, 2.27.11.
7. Ibid, 4.26.1-3.
8. Ibid, 10.125.
9. सहस्रशीर्षा पुरुषः सहस्राक्षः सहस्रपात् । स भूमिं विश्वतो वृत्वात्यतिष्ठद् दशाङ्गुलम् ।। पुरूष एवेदं सर्वं यद्भूतं यच्च भाव्यम् । उतामृतत्वस्येशानो यदन्नेनातिरोहति ।। एतावानस्य महिमाऽतो ज्यायाँश्च पुरुषः पादोऽस्य विश्वा भूतानि त्रिपादस्यामृतं दिवि ।। *Ṛgveda* 10,90. 1-3; Cf. *Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad* 3.16.

uṣasūkta[1] affords a 'what-may-be-termed as' sacrificial theory of creation in the perfect allegorical setting of a *puruṣamedha yāga*[2] identified with *Prajāpati* or *Virāṭ*, the Sole Creator Himself.[3]

The theme of the sūkta runs as follows :

The One puruṣa (the Parabrahman or *Ādipuruṣa*),[4] threefourth part[5] of whom significantly remains unmanifest in a creation symbolizing thereby the *anupahita* or unqualified Reality as the real and permanent nature of all existence,[6] out of a small portion[7] of His

---

1. सोऽयं सर्ववेदान्तवेद्यः परमात्मा स्वमेव स्वकीयया मायया विराड्देहं ब्रह्माण्डरूपं सृष्ट्वा तत्र जीवरूपेण प्रविश्य ब्रह्माण्डाभिमानी देवतात्मा जीवोऽभवत् । *Sāyaṇabhāṣya* on Ṛgveda 10.90. The same hymn appears with little textual differences in *Śuklayajurveda Saṁhitā* 19.6.
2. Creator was in the later *Brāhmaṇa* age identified with sacrifice or *yajña* itself due to the growing importance of ritual performances among the populace. Hence, this *Puruṣa* became known as *yajña* and even the *paśu* of the *puruṣamedha* legend.
3. अथ यस्मात् पुरुषमेधो नामेमे वै लोकाः पूरयमेव पुरुषो योऽयं पवते सोऽस्यां पुरि शेते तस्मात् पुरुषः । तस्य यदेव लोकेष्वन्नं तदस्यान्नं मेधस्तदस्यैनदन्नं मेधस्तस्मात् पुरुषमेधः । *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa* 13.6.2.1; Cf. पुरमात्मज्ञानानन्दादिगुणाध्यात्मनि प्रभूतः पुरुषमेधो यज्ञः प्रजापतिः लोककालाग्न्यादिवपुः पुरुषोत्पत्तिस्थितिसंहृतीनां हेतुः स्वर्गापवर्गमोक्षदो ज्ञानकर्मसमुच्चयकारणं शरीरं, यज्ञो वा अस्यात्मा भवतीति श्रुतिः । Uvvaṭa's commentary on *Ṛgveda* 10.90.1.
4. Cf the opening lines of *Sāyaṇabhāṣya* on the *puruṣasūkta* : ····अव्यक्तमहदादिविलक्षणश्चेतनो यः पुरुषः 'पुरुषान्न परं किञ्चित्' (कठोपनिषद् 1.3.11) इत्यादिश्रुतिषु प्रसिद्धः स देवता । and also : योऽयं पुरुषः संसाररहितो ब्रह्मस्वरूपः···तस्यास्य पादो लेशः सोऽयं इह मायायां पुनरभवत् । सृष्टिसंहाराभ्यां पुनरागच्छति । ibid on *Ṛgveda* 10.90.4.
5. त्रिपादूर्ध्वमुदैत् पूरुषः पादोऽस्येहाभवत् पुनः । *Ṛgveda* 10.90.4; पादोऽस्य विश्वा भूतानि त्रिपादस्यामृतं दिवि । *Ṛgveda* 10.90.3. The *Ṛgveda* also repeats the same essential idea when only one-fourth is said to manifest as creation cf *Sāyaṇabhāṣya on* 1.154.4.
6. The Vedic Ṛṣi does not seem to lose sight of the essential nature of all reality even when describing the myriad manifestations of Puruṣa.
7. In fact this is only a way of saying, for *Virāṭ* is not substantially different

Own Self,[1] created[2] the great[3] *virāṭ*[4] *puruṣa* who again is said to have created the *bhūmi* or *brahmāṇḍaloka*[5] (the universe) as well as pervaded it,[6] and even transcended it.[7] All that grow on food or otherwise, i.e. the animate and the inanimate objects of the universe[8] are His creation and He alone manifests Himself through these and all the same remains eternal.[9] He created these even in the past and shall create them even in the future whenever creation takes place.[10] This *virāṭ*, the Universal Energy or Creative Force of *Ādipuruṣa*,[11] creates the physical elements viz., earth etc., the lokas viz., the various

---

from *ādipuruṣa*. The epithet विराट् (Great), however, fits in with the image of the cosmos or ब्रह्माण्ड as puruṣa as has been conceived here.

[1] त्रिपादूर्ध्वमुदैत्पूरुषः पादोऽस्येहाभवत् पुनः । *Ṛgveda* 10.90.4. Cf. what the Lord Himself says : विष्टभ्याहमिदं कृत्स्नमेकांशेन स्थितो जगत् । *Bhagawadgītā* 10.42.

[2] तस्माद्विराडजायत विराजो अधिपूरुषः । *Ṛgveda* 10.90.5.

[3] सहस्रशीर्षा पुरुषः सहस्राक्षः सहस्रपात् । स भूमि स्पृत्वात्यतिष्ठद् दशाङ्गुलम् ॥ *Ṛgveda* 10.90.1.

[4] Ibid; सर्वप्राणिसमष्टिरूपो ब्रह्माण्डदेहो विराडाख्यो यः पुरूषः सोऽयं etc. of *Sāyaṇabhāṣya* on ibid ; *Ṛgveda* 1.154.

[5] Ibid, 10.90.

[6] Ibid; विश्वतश्चक्षुरुत विश्वतो मुखो विश्वतो बाहुरुत विश्वतस्पात् । सं बाहुभ्यां धमति सं पतत्रैर्द्यावाभूमी जनयन्देव एकः ॥ *Ṛgveda* 10.81.3; Cf. *Śuklayajurvedasaṁhitā* 17.119 and *Śvetāśvataropaniṣad* 3 16.

[7] एतावानस्य महिमातो ज्यायाँश्च पुरुषः । पादोऽस्य विश्वा भूतानि त्रिपादस्यामृतं दिवि ॥ *Ṛgveda* 10 90.3; Cf. यस्य त्री पूर्णा मधुना पदान्यक्षीयमाणा स्वधया मदन्ति । य उ त्रिधातु पृथिवीमुत द्यामेको दाधार भुवनानि विश्वा ॥ *Ṛgveda* 1.154.4

[8] ततो विष्वङ् व्याक्रामत् साशनानशने अभि *Ṛgveda* 10.90.4; Cf. ततो मायायामागत्यानन्तरं विष्वङ् देवमनुष्यतिर्यगादिरूपेण विविधः सन् व्यक्रामद् व्याप्तवान् । किं कृत्वा साशनानशने अभिलक्ष्य साशनं भोजनादिव्यवहारोपेतं चेतनं प्राणिजातम् । अनशनं तद्रहितमचेतनं गिरिनद्यादिकम् । *Sāyaṇabhāṣya* on ibid.

[9] पुरुष एवेदं सर्वं यद्भूतं यच्च भाव्यम् । उतामृतत्वस्येशानो यदन्नेनातिरोहति ॥ *Ṛgveda* 10.90.2.

[10] Ibid; the cyclic process of creation, existence and extinction viz., that of *sṛṣṭi*, *sthiti* and *pralaya* respectively, has been alluded to in this Ṛk.

[11] Cf. *Sāyaṇabhāṣya* on *Ṛgveda* 10.90.5.

regions of the universe and *puraḥ*, i.e., the four types of organic bodies.[1] Here ends the *puruṣasṛṣṭi* portion of the hymn according to Sāyaṇa.[2]

This theory lends itself to a literary or allegorical interpretation of creation in which the puruṣa or the 'physical' human form is said to be born from virāṭ (cf. *virājo adhipuruṣaḥ*) and having been sacrificed by the *sādhya devas* and *ṛṣis*[3] effects the whole creation. In this all-consuming[4] sacrifice the oblation to be offered in the form of *Haviṣ*[5] or *yajñapaśu* (animal for sacrifice),[6] the sacrifice itself,[7] and the *yajamāna devas* etc.[8] are all the *puruṣa* Himself before creation.[9] Again, the *devas* are said to imagine the *puruṣa* as *Haviṣ* etc. and then perform the sacrifice as a *mānasayajña* (conceptual sacrifice)[10]. For, the actual sacrifice in its crudest and grossest form cannot be said to have been practically and physically performed. This will be clear when we pay attention to the following detailed hyperbolic enumerations in the sūkta :

> *When Gods prepared the sacrifice with puruṣa as their offering, its oil was spring, the holy gift was autumn, summer was the wood. They*

---

1. तस्मादेव पुरुषाद् विश्वोत्पतिः । तत्र पूर्वं विराड् अजायत । विराजोऽधिपुरुषः प्रधानं तेजः । स क्षेत्रज्ञो ब्रह्मा सृष्टिकृत् जातः सन् अतिरिच्यते । पश्चाद् अस्मात् क्षेत्रज्ञाद् ब्राह्मणो भूमिः पृथिव्यादौ जाता उत्पन्ना इति । अथोऽनन्तरं पुरः शरीराणि पुराणि चतुर्विधानि भूतान्यजायन्त । पुरादीनि तेनैवोत्पादितानि । एवमेकोंऽशः, तेनैव सर्वं विश्वमुत्पादितमिति । Uvvaṭa's Commentary on *Ṛgveda* 10.90.5.
2. यदा पूर्वोक्तक्रमेणैव शरीरेषूत्पन्नेषु सत्सु देवा उत्तरसृष्टिसिद्ध्यर्थम् etc. *Sāyaṇabhāṣya* on *Ṛgveda* 10.90 6.
3. *Sāyaṇabhāṣya* on *Ṛgveda* 10.90.7.
4. सर्वहुतः । *Ṛgveda* 10.90.9.
5. Ibid, 10.90.16.
6. Cf. the famous orthodox saying न हि पशुभिर्विना यज्ञः प्रसिद्ध्येत or यज्ञार्थं पशवः सृष्टाः
7. *Ṛgveda* 10.90.16.
8. *Sāyaṇabhāṣya* on Ibid.
9. Cf. the commentaries of Sāyaṇa and Mahīdhara on *Ṛgveda* 10.90.7.
10. Commentaries of Sāyaṇa and Mahīdhara on *Ṛgveda* 10.90.16.

> *balmed as victim on the grass puruṣa born in earliest time. With him the Deities and all Sādhyas and Ṛṣis sacrificed. From that great general sacrifice the dripping fat was gathered up. He formed the creatures of the air, and animals both wild and tame. From that general sacrifice Ṛks and Sāma hymns were born. Therefrom were spells and charms produced, the Yajuṣ had its birth from it. From it were horses born, from it all cattle with two rows of teeth; From it were generated kine, from it the goats and sheep were born. When they divided puruṣa how many portions did they make? What do they call his mouth, his arms? What do they call his thighs and feet?*
>
> *The Brāhmaṇa was his mouth, of both his arms was the Rājanya made. His thighs became the Vaiśya, from his feet the Śūdra was produced. The moon was gendered from his mind and from his eye the sun had birth; Indra and Agni from his mouth were born, and Vāyu from his breath. Forth from his navel came mid-air; the sky was fashioned from his head; Earth from his feet, and from his ear the regions. Thus they formed the worlds. Seven fencing sticks had he, thrice seven layers of fuel were prepared, when the Gods, offering sacrifice, bound, as their victim Puruṣa. Gods sacrificing, sacrificed, the victim: these were the earliest holy ordinances. The Mighty ones attained the height of heaven, there were the Sādhyas, Gods of Old dwelling.*[1]

It is important to note here that the whole creation has been presented as a microcosm, the ultimate reality being compared to a huge Cosmic Person. The later concept of the force of Divine Will (*saṁkalpa*)[2] in some form should be accepted as a real clue in this apparently sacrificial theory of creation. In fact *Saṁkalpa* or psychological

---

1. From Griffith's translation of the *Ṛgveda* 10.90.
2. यत्पुरुषं व्यदधुः कतिधा व्यकल्पयन्. *Ṛgveda* 10.90.10; Ibid, 10.90.15; देवा उत्तरसृष्ट्यर्थं वाह्यद्रव्यस्यानुत्पन्नत्वेन हविरन्तरासम्भवात् पुरुषस्वरूपमेव मनसा हविष्ट्वेन संकल्प्य पुरुषेण पुरुषाख्येण हविषा मानसं यज्ञमतन्वतान्वतिष्ठन् ।। *Sāyaṇabhāṣya* 10.90.6.

activity or aspect of creation precedes physical creation. The anthromorphistic imagination of the Universal Principle (Puruṣa) though crudely allegorized does not prevent us from tracing creation from the One Absolute as described above, for the supreme reality itself becomes the *brahmaṇḍadeha* (Cosmos-bodied) Vtrāṭ Puruṣa.

VI. The Tejas Theory

In various passages of the Saṁhitās of whom Ṛgveda appears not only as the most ancient but important as well, the Sun is glorified as *Hiraṇyagarbha*, the 'golden-embrio', and has also been addressed as Prajāpati.[1] Savitṛ again is described as the ruler[2] and the soul[3] of all that moves and stands. He is regarded as responsible for generation or creation.[4] Sun or Sūrya is also identified with a form of *agni* (or *tejas*) as the blazing and the shining element of that name.[5] It may be remarked that agni represents Energy or Tejas element and as such has been associated with all the devas in the Saṁhitās. His (agni's) extraordinary familiarity, brilliance and vitality undoubtedly made of him a real symbol of the supreme (or even immortal) Conscious (or even cosmic) Energy in the Upaniṣads. The notion of chemical action (*pākaviśeṣa*) in *Taittirīya Āraṇyaka* (1.2) which becomes so developed in the Nyāya and the Vaiśeṣika systems later on, also shows its (*agni*'s) ability to shape new things, even as he does so sitting on the primeval substance (mostly water). As such the Sun too (i.e., as a representative of *agni* or *tejas*) has been eulogized as to have enlightened and alone become all this (the whole of the created universe). This very element or creative form (agni, sūrya or prajāpati as mentioned

---

1. *Ṛgveda* 4.53.2. It is to be particularly noted that the creator becomes most well-known by the name of Prajāpati alone in the *Brāhmaṇas*.
2. Ibid, 4.53.6.
3. Ibid, 1.115.1.
4. *Vedic Mythology* by A. A. Macdonell, p. 12, footnote.
5. Cf. *Ṛgveda* 10.121.3 where Savitṛ has, thus, been prayed as the Lord of the Universe by being identified with Hiraṇyagarbha.

above) is variously called by different names, e.g., Indra, Mitra, Varuṇa, Suparṇa and Mātariśvan. It is said that the creator, by whatsoever name we may call him, is but one reality.[1] So the hymns addressed to Prajāpati, to Savitṛ, to Hiraṇyagarbha, to Agni, to Varuṇa or others as 'creators' should not confuse us as to the unitary and uniform character of the Creator God. Let us, however, for the sake of convenience identify that one as the "golden-embrio" or Hiraṇyagarbha.[2] Even the word 'Brahman' is used for Creator in the Atharvaveda[3] later on.

According to the *Hiraṇyagarbha Prājāpatya* hymn[4] :

> *In the beginning arose Hiraṇyagarbha, born Only Lord of all created beings. He fixed and holdeth up this earth and heaven.... Giver of vital breath, of power and vigour, he whose commandments all the gods acknowledge : The Lord of death, whose shade is life immortal.....Who by his grandeur hath become Sole Ruler of all the moving world that breathes and slumbers ; He who is Lord of Men and Lord of Cattle.....His, through his might, are these snowcovered mountains, and men call sea and Rasa his possession : His arms are these, his are these heavenly regions.....By him the heavens are strong and earth is stead-fast, by him light's realm and sky-vault are supported : By him the regions in mid-air were measured.....To him, supported by his help, two armies embattled look while trembling in their spirit, when over them the risen Sun is shining.....What time the mighty waters came, containing the universal germ, producing Agni. Thence sprang the Gods' one spirit into being.....He, in his might, surveyed the floods containing productive force and generating Worship.*[5] *He is the God of the gods, and none beside him.....*

---

1. *Ṛgveda* 1.164.46; ibid, 10.114.5; *Bālakhilya* 10.2.
2. This epithet, curiously enough, can suggest its suitability to both *Sūrya* and *agni*.
3. ब्रह्मेदमूर्ध्वं तिर्यक् चान्तरिक्षं व्यचो हितम् । *Atharvaveda* 10.2.25.
4. *Ṛgveda* 10 121.
5. Thc term यज्ञ rather stands for sacrifice or penance. Cf. the prevalent idea of

> *Ne'er may he harm us who is the earth's Begetter, nor he whose laws are sure, the heaven's Creator, He who brought forth the great and lucid waters.....Prajāpati : thou only comprehendest all these created things, and none beside thee. Grant us our heart's desire when we invoke thee ; may we have store of riches in possession.*[1]

We can deduce the following important ideas concerning creation from this hymn. First, before creation there exist primeval waters (*āpaḥ*) which have the seed of creation in it (*bṛhatīḥ garbhamādadhānā*) in the form of creative force (*dakṣam*) which can primarily be conceived as *tejas* or *cit* alone. Second, these very waters containing the aforesaid *garbha*[2] produce *agni* or fire. It is notable that fire in its purest form has been maintained throughout Indian Philosophy as a form or even the very embodiment of it or Supreme Conscious Energy. After this only, *prajāpati* (or *agni* identified as Creator in this hymn) the Creator, possessed of strength, vitality or energy[3] creates earth (*janitā yaḥ pṛthivyāḥ*) and the *ākāśa* (*divam jajāna*), the famous three regions of *dyaus*, *pṛthivī* and *nākaḥ*[4] and the living beings,[5] the mountains, the oceans etc.[6] In this way the same energy or *tejas*, i. e., *agni* or *prajāpati* produces the rest of the physical elements at the time of creation. Again, all these elements dissolve in the same manner at last even in the primeval waters (which are never without *tejas* or

the Upaniṣads that the creator had to perform तपस् (equatable to something like 'motivated exertion'). Cf. the expression like स: तपोऽतप्त प्रजायेयेति in this connection.

[1] From Griffith's Translation of *Ṛgveda* 10.121.

[2] It is remarkable that the fact of dualism (i.e., the concept that it takes at least two to create) is recognised here, otherwise water alone could have been mentioned as all-creating.

[3] Cf. the words महित्वा in the 2nd, अवसा in the 6th and महिना in the 8th *Ṛks* of this hymn.

[4] *Ṛgveda* 10.121.5.

[5] Ibid, 10.121.3.

[6] Ibid, 10.121.4.

its substitute). Likewise the souls or imperial selfs of men, gods, birds, beasts etc. (*asuḥ*) also come to exist from the same source, viz., *Tejas* or *Hiraṇyagarbha*.[1]

One may now in this context ask why not *āpaḥ* or waters be accepted as the sole element or principle responsible for the generation of the Universe ?[2] Our answer should be that the water and the fire both together generate or create the universe[3]—the five physical elements and in a graded way the later 'sub-creations' of the mountains, the vast spaces (or lokas), the organic bodies of living beings,[4] and the inanimate objects etc. found in the Universe. In respect to a further possible doubt as to which one of these two is more or less solely responsible (may be, in order of priority) for the phenomena of creation and as such deserves the repeatedly occurring epithet of "*kasmai devāya haviṣā vidhema*", and the description of "*Hiraṇyagarbhaḥ samavartatāgre*" as well as "*bhūtasya jātaḥ patireka āsīt*" in the first Ṛk, it should be understood that *Tejas* and not *āpaḥ* is the creator of the whole Universe, the latter may even be eliminated if necessary.[5] For example, even in this hymn *Hiraṇyagarbha* (i.e. our *tejas*) is said to have created the ever growing (or evolving[6]) waters - *Yaścāpaścandrā bṛhatīrjajāna*.[7] Again, *Tejas* appears as *cetana* and therefore, can move and participate (freely) in the act of creation, while

---

1. *Ṛgveda* 10.121.7-8; 10.82.5-6; cf. *Sāyaṇabhāṣya* on ibid, 10.90.5.
2. Ibid, 10.82.6.
3. See the contrast between this and the trivṛtkaraṇa of *Chāndogya Upaniṣad* dealt with in chapter III later on.
4. *Ṛgveda* 10.82.
3. The passages in the later Vedic period like आपो वै प्रथमं ससर्ज (बृ० 6.2) for example, are clearly expressive of the predominance of *tejas* (i.e., the conscious energy) as creator in Vedic thought.
6. Cf. the concept of प्रकृति as कर्त्री or doer in the Sāṅkhya school later on.
7. *Ṛgveda* 10.121.9; Cf. also 10.80.1 and ibid, 3.38.5 where *Indra* is said to create āpaḥ in the beginning.

āpaḥ, though evolving (*bṛhatīḥ*)[1] are at their best *jaḍa* (inert), needing the *garbha* (*tejorūpa vīrya or retas*)[2] to motivate it. But as the Creator can only be a conscious energy the inert waters too are maintained as created by it. Thus, the twofold tejas or agni before creation has been called *tirohita* and the same when manifest in creation has been addressed as *purohita*. Hence, it may be said that most probably the theory ends in the favourite note of Vedic Monism.

VII. The Non-being Theory

In a particular cosmogonic hymn of the Saṁhitā it is stated that the Existent sprang from the Non-Existent—*asataḥ sadajāyata.*[3] Here *Brahmaṇaspati* is said to have forged this world like a smith, with blast and smelting-*brahmaṇaspatiretā saṁ Karmāra ivādhamat*; the line is quite unconnected with the main theory of creation being advanced here and as such may be labelled by us as just a passing remark of the seer. Then, the hymn twice repeats its original contribution to the theory of creation from the non-existent (*devānāṁ pūrvye yuge asataḥ sadajāyata* and, again, *devānāṁ yuge prathame asataḥ sadajāyata*).[4]

---

1. *Ṛgveda* 10.121.4.
2. *Retas* and *Āpaḥ* may respectively be compared to the scientific concepts of the Kinetic and Potential forms of energy, though on a very small scale. Note that *Āpaḥ* are also called *retodhā* and the fact that *Garbha* (representing *vīrya* or *retas*) is sustained by mātā (mother) and provided by pitā (father) even in human regeneration. Note, also, how this very idea strikingly seems to have originally suggested the Sāṅkhyayoga concept of *Prakṛti* evolving by the mere *saṁnidhi* (i.e. proximity) of the *cetana puruṣa* or conscious energy. Nevertheless, it must be admitted that there the *puruṣa* plays rather a passive role and dualism (or even pluralism) is the final thesis of their concept and not monism.
3. *Ṛgveda* 10.72. Cf. *Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad* 2.1-2.
4. *Ṛgveda* 10.72; Cf. *Atharvaveda* 10.2.28.

This puts before us in unmistakable terms that the existent is born from the non-existent. Subsequently were born the *Uttānapāda* (*ākāśa* or sky),[1] the *Bhūḥ* (earth), *āśāḥ* (regions or quarters of the horizon),[2] the *Aditiḥ* (the famous legendary mother of gods) and the *aṣṭau devāḥ* (the gods including the *mārtaṇḍa*) each after the immediately preceding existence or creation. Sun[3] is in a mysterious way described as being left for further generation (*prajāyai*) and extinction (*mṛtyave*) of the *bhuvaans* (i.e., the universe and its objects—"the created ones"[4]) which are, the seer submits, caused to grow (*apinvata*) by the gods (*devas*) who are, again, like ('*Yatayaḥ*' i.e.)those who exert, do penance or sacrifice for the common good. In this way, first the creation, then the birth of the gods and at last the coming into being of the sun have been described here in the peculiar Vedic fashion.

It was generally believed that nothing could exist without being created first. Hence *Sat* means that which exists and *Asat* that which does not. Thus, the proper explanation of '*asataḥ sadajāyata*' would be that that which exists (after creation) came to exist after (or from) that which did not have ('that later') existence. Accordingly while repudiating *śūnyavāda* Śaṁkara has interpreted *asat* as *asadiva*[5]. In that case, then, the *śruti* '*asataḥ sadajāyata*' may be taken as a precursor of the later *satkāryavāda* of the Sāṅkhyayoga school.

---

1. Cf. Wallis, who renders '*uttānapāda*' by the terms 'the begetter (sky)'; and Griffith does it by the terms 'Productive Power'.
2. As interpreted by Griffith and Wilson respectively. There is, however, very little difference between the two.
3. Macdonell (Cf. *Vedic Mythology* p. 12 f. n.) and Wallis (Cf. *Cosmology of the Ṛgveda* Ch. II) also think that in the cosmological speculation of the *Ṛgveda* the Sun was regarded as an important agent of generation.
4. Cf. the√भू meaning that which becomes or comes to exist, and, the significant use of the term *bhuvanaṃ* here.
5. *Śāṁkarabhāṣya* 2.1.17.

Another notable point that deserves our attention in this hymn is the fact that towards the end *Sūrya*[1]—as the representative of the generative and extinctive forces which we have discussed above—is left as the only possible 'god' (or existence) known to ordinary human mind capable of being viewed as a Creator. The peculiar relationship of *Sūrya* or *Savitṛ* to the other prominent gods of the Vedic pantheon is predominantly reflected in the manner in which the common features of all the gods are emphasized time and again. These common features may be taken to be *dyotamānatva* (to shine and to enlighten), *prerakatva* (to move, force or urge to activity) or *prasavitṛtva* (to giving birth), *gatimattva* (to stir or move) and last but not the least, *cetanatva* (consciousness). All these may be suggested by using the word *tejas* alone which is symbolic for Conscious Energy and should we not, perhaps, praise the great wisdom of the Vedic Ṛṣis when we cannot even today find a better agency than that possessing this kind of *tejastva*[2] for being called a Creator ?

VIII. The Order or background (Ṛta) of Creation

Thus, the creation of the universe has been traced at one place[3] from *tapas*[4] (warmth or fervour) from which originated *Ṛta*[5] (Eternal Law of Cosmic arrangement and harmony) as well as *Satya* (Truth). *Ṛta* signifies here the basic principle or background of all creation or a sort of moral order under which all phenomena in the universe are related as cause and effect, action and its fruit. Here *Satya* denotes the phase of physical evolution simultaneously getting manifested with the above Ṛta or the psychic activity in the process of creation, of the Creator (*dhātā*). Then *Rātri* (night) was born and from it the billowy flood of sea (*samudro*(*a*)*rṇavaḥ*). From the sea (or waters) the *saṁvatsara*[1] (i. e. the Year or the cycle of created existence)[2] was born, about whom it is said : *ahorātrāṇi vidadhadviśvasya miṣato vaśī* –that it created or ordained the days and nights thereby acting as a Lord Controller of those 'that close the eyes' (i.e. all the living beings). It seems the functioning of the creations and their timings are entirely under His supervision, for, we are next told that the same Creator (*dhātā*) formed (*akalpayat*)[3] the sun and the moon (*suryācandramasau*), the outer space (*dyaus*), the earthly region (*pṛthivī*), the region of the air (*antarikṣa*) and the *jyotirloka* (*svaḥ*).[4]

---

[1] *Ṛgveda* 10.211.6; *Yajurveda* 4.53.2; ibid, 4.53.6.

[2] This can be easily identified with or compared to *tapas* mentioned at the beginning of the following section.

[3] *Ṛgveda* 10.190.

[4] i. e. the Creative Energy. Cf. the later concept of तपस् i. e. devotional ardour or asceticism of the Creator or *Brahman* (vide the recurring statements like सः तपोऽतप्त, सोऽकामयत एकोऽहं बहु स्याम etc. in the *Brāhmaṇas* and the *Upaniṣads* alike).

[5] We may generally interpret ऋत to mean 'constant truth' and interpret सत्य to mean 'variable truth' in the context of the phenomenon of creation.

From the nature and the description of the above hymn there remains no doubt about its cosmological contents. First, the order of creation has been described. The use of the word *ajāyata* in this context is quite a significant pointer to this conspicuous fact. True, the prefix *adhi* and the use of *apādāna* in *arṇavāt* etc. hint at the priority of the creation or production of satya etc. in comparison to those mentioned after them (cf. the oft-used term *tataḥ*). No more is communicated to us.

---

1. Cf. *Sāyaṇabhāṣya* on *Ṛgveda* 10.190 and also ततः संवत्सरे पुरुषः समभवत् स प्रजापतिः । *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa* 11.1.62.
2. Cf. the concept of *sthiti* following *sṛṣṭi* in orthodox Indian Philosophy.
3. Cf. this with the term समकल्पयन् of *puruṣasukta* (*Ṛgveda* 10.90), and it is clear that the creation by 'gods' is of a different kind based on सम्+कल्प् (i.e. Divine or motivated powerful Will). In fact, the creation of *virāṭ puruṣa* and again by *virāṭ* of the gods and everything else have already been effected and the gods are merely performing a *mānasayajña*.
4. *Svaḥ* is also one of the seven regions (Cf. f. n. 1 on p. 29) of the universe as coneived by the Vedic geographers.

In the lines that follow next, we have a concrete figure of a *dhātā*, the creator, and His act of creation (cf. the use of altogether different words '*akalpayat*' and '*vidadhat*' in this context). The Creator shaped or produced the sun and the moon and the outer space, the earth, the mid-region (of air) and the region of the light[1] as in the preceding age (or creation)[2]:

> *sūryācandramasau dhātā yathāpūrvamakalpayat divañca pṛthivīñcāntarikṣamatho svaḥ*[3]

The creator is also called the ordainer or Supreme Controller of of all the beings in the Universe (*viśvasya miṣato vaśī*). We may, thus, infer from this (as well as similar other instances elsewhere in the Saṁhitās that to control and guide the (changing) movements and activities of the created universe[1] is also a necessary attribute of the Vedic Creator. Because the *sūryācandramasau*, i.e., the sun and the moon are capable of being created again and again (may be times without number) by the same Creator the created Universe can be conceived as practically anitya (transitory) and the Creator as eternal (the contrast here is very clear) for He honours and even upholds the Eternal Law (*Ṛta*) and Turth (*Satya*) in the cosmos during all such creations.

---

[1] *Bhūḥ, bhuvaḥ, svaḥ, mahaḥ, janaḥ, tapaḥ* and *satyam* are the seven ūrdhva (i.e. prominent or lofty) lokas or regions of the created cosmos or *braamāṇḍa* according to the *Ṛṣis* and the first is the lowest and the last is the highest situated. The higher the loka the earlier will be its formation according to the orthodox view. But, it is to be noted that the *samuccayārthaka 'ca'* in the hymn in question is suggestive of the creation of all the regions simultaneously and not one by one.

[2] Cf. the concluding portion of the hymn (*Ṛgveda* **10**.190) under discussion.

[3] The background of *Ṛta* (i.e. cosmic order) and *satya* (i. e. ultimate or abiding and absolute truth) here poses the regular arrangement of generation and extinction in the process of creation. *Yathāpūrvam* hints to the concept of a suitable moment for the start of each creation. Cf. the later *paurāṇika* concept of creation and destruction of the universe by the Lord *Viṣṇu* at the beginning of a *Kalpa* Thus, *Kalpa* (originally meaning the act of creation Cf. √'कल्प्') came to constitute one of the larger units of time in the *purāṇas* and time (काल) came to constitute one of the Lord's chief attributes (Cf. *Viṣṇupurāṇa* 1.2.13-17; ibid, 1.2 63-66) through which He creates, sustains and destroys the universe which is described as *ekārṇava* (one vast ocean so to say) when unmanifest or dissolved. Cf. also कालोऽस्मि लोकक्षयकृत्प्रवृद्धो etc. in *Gitā* 11.32 and ये द्वे कालं विधत्तः as referring to two of the eight important manifestations or *mūrtis* of *Śiva* in the *Nāndī* of Kālidāsa's *Śākuntalam*.

Thus, the lines of this hymn most decisively present the picture of a competent and eternal Creator responsible for the laws of *Ṛta* or the order of creation (sṛṣṭikrama) as well as uniformity and harmony in the working of the universe (*satya*). Further, the order of creation —that first there was night (compatible with the concept of darkness or non-being at the very dawn of creation as discussed earlier), next were the primeval waters containing and hence the platform[2] of, the *saṁvatsara*[3] who having risen immediately ordains (cf. *vidadhat*) the proper functioning of days and nights and becomes the controller of all beings, and as the last phase there was the creation of the various quarters of the Universe itself by the aforesaid *saṁvatsara*—who while engaged in this creation is called *dhātā* here—has been put forth in unequivocal terms.

---

[1] Cf the concept of परिणामिनी प्रकृति in सांख्य later on and also the modern concept of changes in Energy ever from Kinetic to potential or static form and *vice versa* going on in the Universe.

[2] Cf. the prefix 'adhi' in the opening line of *Ṛgveda* 10.190.2; also Cf. *Ṛgveda* 9.108 8; and ibid, 1.1.105-15 for the inter-relation of the concepts of Ṛta and *Satya* as spealt out above.

[3] *Saṁvatsara* and *dhātā* in this hymn match suitably when compared to the *Hiraṇyagarbha* and the Agni respectively of the *Hiraṇyagarbhasūkta*; the first is merely Potential Energy before creation and the second in both the cases represents Active Energy engaged in and in relation with the created universe. It is further gratifying to recall how *Prajāpati* is, later on, said to be the first creation of *Ṛta* (Cf. *Taittirīya Āraṇyaka* 1.23), the latter (i.e. Ṛta) being identical with सत्य or यज्ञ (Cf. *Nirukta* of Yāska 4.19.9).

We have no hesitation, therefore, in declaring that this hymn represents quite a mature and advanced Vedic thinking on the problem of creation and is one of the most important summing-ups of the various 'apparently' distorted and unconnected passages indicatng ameturish attempts or realisations of the phenomenon of creation.

IX. The Will Theory

The hymn called the *nāsadīyasūkta* or the song of creation[1] gives a comprehensive idea of the theory of creation in the Saṁhitās and is full of stimulating suggestions to synthesize the different variegated visions of the 'creation phenomenon' as have been examined so far.

It would, therefore, be in the fitness of things to get acquainted with the text so charmingly translated into English by the great German Indologist Max Muller :

> *There was then neither what is, nor what is not, there was no sky, nor the heaven which is beyond. What covered ? Where was it ? and in whose shelter ? Was the water the deep abyss (in which it lay) ?*
>
> *There was no death, hence was there nothing immortal. There was no light (distinction) between night and day. That one breathed by itself without, other than it there has been nothing.*
>
> *Darkness there was, in the beginning a sea without light, the germ that lay covered by the husk, that one was born by the power of heat (tapas).*
>
> *Love overcame it in the beginning which was the seed springing from mind, poets having searched in their heart found by wisdom the bond of what is in what is not.*

---

[1] *Ṛgveda* 10.129.1-7.

> *Their ray which was stretched across, was it below or was it above? There were seed-bearers, there were powers, self-power below, and will above.*
>
> *Who then knows, who has declared it here, from whence was born this creation? The gods came later than this creation, who then knows whence it arose?*
>
> *He from whom this creation arose, whether he made it or did not make it, the highest seer in the highest heaven, he forsooth knows or does even he not know?*"

Kāma ('love' in the English translation above) most probably stands for a perosnfied Desire only and not for love in the Ṛgveda. *Yaṁ Kāmaye tantamugraṁ kṛṇomi taṁ brahmāṇaṁ tamṛṣiṁ taṁ sumedhām* (Ṛgveda 10.125). This meaning is quite satisfactory in the present context. We might think, therefore, that *Kāma* had not during the Vedic period acquired the modern sense of love or sexual urge. On the contrary *so(a)kāmayat* appears side by side with *Saḥ tapo(a)tapta* signifying a concerted motive to do something and an actual effort in mind in the *Upaniṣads*.

It may be noted that this hymn can be conveniently classed as essentially philosophical in the sense that not a single line assumes here the garb of vague mythology of any sort. It states the theory of creation in the Saṁhitās in a straightforward mannner. The theory of the origin of the universe cannot be called pluralistic or even dualistic here.

The hymn unambiguously and significantly refuses to say anything about what existed before creation and according to it neither *sat* (being) nor *asat* (non-being) existed then. So far we have had only such conceptions of the Ultimate Reality from which the creation originates or is caused as were related to either being or non-being.[1]

---

[1] *Ṛgveda* 10.129.1-2.

The thought expressed in similar already discussed hymns regarding the actual existence of primeval waters, a deep abyss, darkness, death, night etc. is also waived aside and is unacceptable to the seer at this stage of explaining his gradually unfolding vision of the phenomenon of creation in this hymn.[1] This difficult and abstract concept of the nature of the unmanifest state before creation (so to say) is brought home to us, however, by the allusions to and suggestions behind, the images of the sea enveloped in darkness[2] and of the germ (whose creative powers have not manifested themselves) covered by husk.[3] The recourse to the image of the supposed existence of a dark abyss of waters is just to convey the idea that everything was absent in the sense of being unmanifested and unknown, as well as, present because, the tapas (heat or energy) as a germ did possess the mahiman (potency or *Śakti*) to produce everything even then.

This very *tejas* (energy) has earlier in the hymn, been referred to as the 'That One' (*tadekam*) breathing by Itself because nothing existed except It.[4] The *tejas* was (as it were) born (*ajāyata*) or it became manifest due to the force (*mahinā*) of heat (*tapas*)[5] which was inseparable from it previously as germ (or grain) from husk before production of the sprout (cf. *tucchyenābhvapihitaṁ yadāsīt................tat*

---

1. *Ṛgveda* 10.129.1-2.
2. तम आसीत्तमसा गूल्हमग्रेऽप्रकेतं सर्वमा इदम् *Ṛgveda* 10.129.3.
3. *Ṛgveda* 10.129.3.
4. Ibid, 10.129.2. *Tadekam* as described here suggests "nothing beyond the positive and unitary character of the ultimate principle. We are here on the threshold of Upnisadic Monism". Hiriyanna's *Outline of Indian Philosophy* p. 42.
5. Wilson translates *'tapasaḥ'* by "austerity" meaning thereby the contemplation of the things that were to be created. Cf. *Sāyaṇabhāṣya* at this place. It appears that *tapas* suggests a principle explaining all sorts of movement, life and thought.

....................*ajāyataikam*[1] in which '*tucchyenābhvapihitam*' is used as a meaningful metaphor for the unmanifest '*tadekam*'). It is clear that That One (i.e. Universal Consciousness)[2] other than which did not exist[3] manifested Itself into so many aspects of the Universe in the course of time (*ajāyata* denotes the manifestation which took place later in respect of time) only due to the *Tejas*, called *Tapas*, the Universal Light or the Energy.

Then, there was the Will[4] or Desire (*kāma*) which was the link between the Unmanifest and the Manifest.

In the words of Dr. Radhakrishnan 'desire' constitutes the secret of the being of the Universe, it is the 'sign of self-consciousness', 'the grem of the mind' and 'it denotes intellectual stir, the sense of deficiency as well as active effort'[5].

It is the bond binding the existent to the non-existent.[6]

Thus, the fact that creation is the result of the active participation or Will of the creator is recognised here. This will (*kāma*) would be ineffective without the contribution of the previously described tapas or Heat or Force inherent in the One Universal Consciousness.[7]

---

1. *Ṛgveda* 10.129.3.
2. Umesha Mishra's *A History of Indian Philosophy* Vol. I, p. 59.
3. तस्माद्घान्यन्न परः किचनास । *Ṛgveda* 10 129.2.
4 *Ṛgveda* 10.129.4. Desire of the Creator is accepted here as in the theory of creation of some of the Schools of orthodox Indian Philosophy later on, e.g., in the *Nyāyavaiśeṣika*. *Līlā* and *Vivarta* theories of creation in the different schools of the *Vedānta* present a great contrast when compared to this 'Will' aspect involved in the creation of the Universe.
5. Dr. S. Radhakrishnan's *Indian Philosophy*, Vol. I, pp. 99-105.
6. सतो बन्घुमसति निरविन्दन्हृदि प्रतीष्या कवयो मनीपा, *Ṛgveda* 10.129.4.
7. Cf. तपोऽतप्यत *Praśnopaniṣad* 1.3.4; स ईक्षत लोकान्नु सृजा इति *Aitareyu Upaniṣad* 1.1.3; *Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad* 1.4.1-4; and the later concept of ईश्वर as कर्माध्यक्षः सर्वभूताधिवासः Cf '*Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad* 6.11 and ibid, 6.2.

As to the gods, the hymn says, they are certainly of later origin[1], but all the same we notice a vague extension of the varied phenomena of creation to find ultimate powers or energies (cf. *mahimānaḥ*) in regions high up or down below described as correlative : *begetters, mighty forces, free action here and energy yonder*[2]. But this description is vague.

Similar inconclusiveness and cautious approach overwhelmingly pervade the last two stanzas the first of which, extolls that the truth or real assessment of creation (i.e. whether, whence and how it took place) having not been perceived by anyone created later or known in the first instance in the beginning, may remain practically unknowable or in plain words incommunicable for theorists of all ages.

That the perfect knowledge of this creation or Universe is imagined to be accessible, if at all, to its superintendent (*asyādhyakṣaḥ*) alone who lives in His highest region is the theme of the last stanza.

This thought that God—Supreme Reality or Authority alone is all-knowing (*sarvajña*) by dint of being the lone observer (evidence or *sākṣī*) of all the universe is gracefully put forward in the last stanza.

It is interesting to know how this very concept of *sākṣimattva* or 'one's being an observer' is developed in the later schools of Indian Philosophy, specially the Sāṅkhya and the Vedānta. The unknowableness and the mysteriousness of creation (or universe for that matter) developed later into the concept of *anirvacanīya māyā* in Vedānta and the indescribable nature of Reality devoid of the created objects as reflected in the opening lines of this hymn predicts the later conception of *nirguṇa Brahman* as '*yato vāco nivartante aprāpya manasā saha*' in the Upaniṣads.

---

[1] Ṛgveda 10.129.6.

[2] Ṛgveda 10.129.5. Griffith's translation.

But the most remarkable contribution of this hymn to the later theories of the main orthodox schools of Indian Philosophy[1] in particular and to Indian thought in general lies in the background of all creation as depicted here viz., the roles of *jñānaśakti*, the *icchāśakti* and the *kriyāśakti* emphasized through the forms of the Universal Consciousness,[2] the Will Power[3], and then the actual act of Creation.[4] This is quite clear from our observations made above.

X. Conclusion

From the account given so far of the Saṁhitās it has become obvious that the *Ṛṣis* having had the *aparokṣānubhūti* (direct realization) of the highest truth or knowledge (i.e. of the *mantras*) have expressed them for the good or proper understanding of the *adhikārins* (or men) of different categories or levels as revelations (cf. *Ṛṣayo mantradraṣṭāraḥ*) of the different visions of a single truth. They were, thus, capable of giving out the highest and the noblest theories (if the term theory is to be used here at all) of creation for *upadeśa* most vividly. The original experience of the seers (*Ṛṣis*) was only 'translated' into (i.e. revealed through) the Ṛk which was the only possible way of conveying a glimpse into the Reality to the *non-seers* (those who could not directly visualize the truth). The next development was when the Ṛks, too, became incomprehensible and obscure and it became necessary to frame the six means of Veda (i.e., *vedāṅgas*) for bringing out and exploiting the full meaning and significance of the Ṛks.[5]

[1] Cf. *Kāśmīra Śaivism.*

[2] *Ṛgveda* 10.129.2.

[3] Ibid, 10.129.4.

[4] Ibid, 10.129 5-6.

[5] Cf. how Yāska explains the origin of the spoken mantras (i.e.. the Ṛks) and later on of the *Vedāṅgas* साक्षात्कृतधर्माणो ऋषयो वभूवुस्तेऽवरेभ्योऽसाक्षात्कृतधर्मंभ्य उपदेशेन मन्त्रान् सम्प्रादुः । उपदेशाय ग्लायन्तोऽवरे बिल्मग्रहणायेमं ग्रन्थं समाम्नासिषुर्वेदं वेदाङ्गानि च । *Nirukta* 1.6.5.

Hence, the belief[1] of the generality of modern scholars to class the *mantras* or Ṛks putting forth mature, higher or advanced views about Creation and Reality as of later origin on the basis of their supposition that the more ancient a theory the more undeveleped, simple, 'piecemeal' and naive it must appear to reason and *vice versa*, is to be rejected outright. After all, why should we not be impartial in agreeably viewing and accepting the Vedic people as highly civilised and the Ṛṣis in those days really capable of giving out the very high thoughts that are contained in the Vedic Literature on the face of 'sound' reasons in support of the wisdom and the wealth of knowledge available to us in the Saṁhitās ?

In fact, myriads of generations of the highest intellectuals of one of the greatest countries of the world like ours have thought it wise to seek inspiration for or at least confirmation of their doctrines in the Saṁhitās and the Upaniṣads. Noblity of concepts, immaculate reasoning and sublimity of expression characterized the common spirit of the Saṁhitās. The gradual development of thought reflected in the different theories of creation can be ascribed to the various single visions of the same truth realized by the different Ṛṣis. The same truth pervades all the theories, as we have seen even the vision of non-being is not incompatible with that of absolute monism in practice.

Finally, we can conclude that only in words the theories differ and not in their essence, i.e., the common truth or ground is reflected everywhere.[2] Thus, *Sāyaṇa* remarks in his bhāṣya on Ṛṣi Vāmadeva's experiences[3] : *Paramārtha-dṛṣṭyā kṛtsnamapi ahamevāsmi He Janā māṁ sarvātmakaṁ paśyata|| Yūyamapyevameva svasvarūpam anubhavatetyuktambhavati.*, i.e., "From the point of reality I (Vāmadeva) am everything. O men ! know me all-pervasive. You people also should, in the same way, realize your nature. This is what has been said by Vāmadeva".

---

[1] Cf. *A History of Sanskrit Literature* by Arthur A. Macdonell, pp. 111-112.

[2] Cf. passages like एकं सद्विप्रा बहुधा वदन्ति, इन्द्रो मायाभिः पुरुरूप ईयते etc. in the *Saṁhitās*.

[3] *Ṛgveda* 4.26.1-3.

3

THE UPANIṢADS

I. Introduction

Philosophical speculation continued[1] to blossom forth into yet more magnificient and developed theories of creation in the period of the Upaniṣads. We shall now, therefore, endeavour to take into stock the different points of view available to us in the Upaniṣads concerning the problem of creation and evaluate their philosophical worth.

The settled recurrence of all happenings in nature filled the Upaniṣadic inquirer after truth with an impulse to find out the real meaning of all these phenomena. Hence, we find the primary search after the substratum of things or the ultimate reality which abides in the midst of change. The sage of *Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad*[2] asks in wonder at the very beginning of his treatise :

> *From whom are we born, in whom do we live and have our being ?*

---

[1] See chapter II.

[2] कि कारणं ब्रह्म कुत: स्म जाता जीवाम केन क्व च संप्रतिष्ठा: *Śvetāśvataropaniṣad* 1.1.

A cryptic formula of the *Chāndogya Upaniṣad* declares that a man must compose himself in the belief that the world has come out of, lives in, and is finally absorbed in the absolute.[1] Likewise, the *Taittirīya Upaniṣad* declares that behind the cosmos there must be an existence which may be regarded as responsible for its origin, sustenance and absorption :

> *that in truth from which all these beings come into existence, that by which they live, that into which they are finally absorbed, know that to be the eternal, verily the absolute.*[2]

II. The Absolute

According to this doctrine all objects are centred in the self, as all thoughts are centred in the mind, as all touches in the skin, as all waters in the ocean.[3] Ātman pervades all like salt in water.[4] The Supreme Brahman is independent of the universal rule of causality according to which all changes in the world proceed, it is celebrated as the imperishable (*Akṣaram*). The absolute changelessness of Brahman is very definitely expressed in some passages [5]:

> *As unity we must regard him Imperishable; unchanging, Eternal, not becoming, not ageing Exalted above space, the great self.*

The immutable nature of Reality is taught in a famous line of *Chāndogya Upaniṣad* in the following words : "Change (for example, ghaṭa as a derived form of earth) is a mere matter of words, earth (i.e.,

---

1. तज्जलानिति शान्त उपासीत *Chāndogyopaniṣad* 3.14.1.
2. यतो वा इमानि भूतानि जायन्ते येन जातानि जीवन्ति यत्प्रयन्त्यभिसंविशन्ति तद्विजिज्ञासस्व तद्ब्रह्मेति । *Taittirīyopaniṣad* 3.1.
3. स यथा सर्वासामपां समुद्र एकायनमेवं सर्वेषां स्पर्शानां त्वगेकायनमेवं....*Bṛhadāraṇyakopaniṣad* 2.4.11.
4. स यथा सैन्धवखिल्य उदके प्रास्त उदकमेवानुविलीयेत न हास्योद्ग्रहणायेव स्यात्...वा अर इदं महद्भूतमनन्तमपारं विज्ञानघन एव । Ibid, 2.4.12.
5. एकधैवानुद्रष्टव्यमेतदप्रमेयं ध्रुवम् । विरजः पर आकाशादज आत्मा महान्ध्रुवः ॥ Ibid 4.4.20.

substance or reality) alone is Ṭrue.”[1] Brahman is also described as the knowing subject.[2] The relation of cause and effect (*kāraṇa* and *kārya*), source and result (*hetu* and *phala*), perceived and perceiving (*dṛśya* and *draṣṭā*) is unthinkable in the self-existent (Brahman or Reality).[3] In the whole creation there is no second outside of him,[4] no other distinct from him. There is here no plurality at all.[5]

Love of reality and dispassionate reasoning, however, obliged the Upaniṣadic thinker not only to concede the reality of the manifold universe but at the same time to maintaining that all this is certainly Brahman Itself.[6] Brahman, thus, is defined as *satyasya satyam*,[7] “the reality of reality”, with the knowledge of which this entire universe becomes known.[8]

Later, the immutability of Brahman is preserved through the conception of transcendence. We have so far seen how the univese and the Brahman are identified as one and that the Reality is immanent in all this multiplicity of creation. Yet, it is said, it has not only created the whole of existence, not only has it brought it into being, but, having created all this has veritably entered into it.[9] The very fact of immanence here signifies its transcendence, for the Upaniṣadic approach to reality is always through the universal to the transcendental. *Anupraveśa* does not indicate something like the entering of

1. यथा सोम्येकेन मृत्पिण्डेन सर्वं मृन्मयं विज्ञातं स्याद् वाचारम्भणं विकारो नामधेयं मृत्तिकेत्येव सत्यम् । *Chāndogyopaniṣad* 6.1.3.
2. *Kaṭhopaniṣad* 4.3; *Māṇḍūkyopaniṣad* 3,4,5.
3. *Māṇḍūkyakārikā* 4.11-31.
4. *Bṛhadāraṇyakopaniṣad* 4.3.23-30.
5. नेह नानास्ति किञ्चन । मृत्योः स मृत्युमाप्नोति य इह नानेव पश्यति । *Bṛhadāraṇyakopaniṣad* 4.4.19; Cf. also *Kaṭhopaniṣad* 2.1.10, 11.
6. सर्वं खल्विदं ब्रह्म । *Chāndogyopaniṣad* 3.14.1.
7. *Bṛhadāraṇyakopniṣad* 2.1.20.
8. *Muṇḍakopaniṣad* 1.3; *Bṛhadāraṇyakopaniṣad* 2.4.5; ibid, 1.4.7; *Çhāṇdogyopaniṣad* 6.1.2.
9. यदिदं किञ्च । तत्सृष्ट्वा । तदेवानुप्राविशत् । *Taittirīyopaniṣad* 2.6,

one thing into another but simply points to the fact that by the act of creation the supreme reality has made itself accessible to the intellect (buddhi), which, again, is the subtlest as well as the very first and foremost principle in creation.[1] Only the subtle can enter into the gross and the Brahman or supreme reality surpasses the intellect in subtleness. On the other hand we are told that, "other than the known, and more than the unknown is That."[2] Similarly, the classic '*Neti Neti*' doctrine of Yājñavalkya points to the *vilakṣaṇatva* (distinctness) and another passage to the pūrṇatva (inexhaustible fulness) of reality.[3] Thus, the denial of attributes and qualifications to Brahman does not reduce it to a void. From the idealistic point of view the absolute Ātman alone enters into the self through the self.[4]

The concept of māyā finds ample mention in the Upaniṣads. It measures (*mīyate anayā*) the immeasurable, sets a limit to the limitless, for unless the vastness of the infinite (*bhūmā*) is concealed it beoomes impossible to represent it as small or finite.[5] This māyā or power of the Brahman has two functions—concealment and distraction. Such āvaraṇa or concealment[6] of truth or reality as well as such *vikṣepa* or distraction[7] are referred to again and again. The second function is also referred to in the famous line *indro māyābhiḥ pururūpa īyate*

---

1. इन्द्रियेभ्यः परा ह्यर्था अर्थेभ्यश्च परं मनः । मनसस्तु परा वुद्धिर्वुद्धेरात्मा महान्परः । *Kaṭhopaniṣad* 1.3.10.
2. अन्यदेव तद् विदितादथो अविदितादधि *Kenopaniṣad* 1.3.
3. ॐ पूर्णमदः पूर्णमिदं पूर्णात्पूर्णमिदमुच्यते । पूर्णस्य पूर्णमादाय पूर्णमेवावशिष्यते ।। (शान्तिपाठः) *Iśopaniṣad.*
4. *Māṇḍūkyopaniṣad* 12.
5. यतो वाचो निवर्तन्ते अप्राप्य मनसा सह । *Taittirīyopaniṣad* 2.9; *Māṇḍūkyopaniṣad* 7.
6. तदेतदमृतं सत्येन च्छन्नम् । *Bṛhadāraṇyakopaniṣad* 1.6.3; also Cf. एते सत्याः कामा अनृतापिधानाः *Chāndogyopaniṣad* 8.3.2.
7. Cf. *Ṛgveda* 6.47.18 रूपं रूपं प्रतिरूपो बभूव तदस्य रूपं प्रतिचक्षणाय । इन्द्रो मायाभिः पुरुरूप ईयते ।। and similar conformatory passage in *Bṛhadāraṇyakopaniṣad* 2.5.19.

where the assuming of 'different and various' forms of objects is attributed to a characterstically 'plural (i. e., manifold)' māyā or power of the supreme reality. It is remarkable that the concept of māyā is not that of illusion or nothing, instead it is described as 'the golden lid' which 'covers the face of truth'.[1] Again, it is sometimes called the 'truth' and then side by side the reality is called the 'immortal' symbolizng thereby the fact that the one is the empirical truth and the other absolute truth (*satyasya satyam*).[2]

III. The Theory of Emanation

According to this, "from the Ātman in the first instance, proceeded or emanated ether, from ether air, fron air fire, from fire water, and from water the earth".[3] Significantly enough, we have here a complete enumeration of the five different elements procieding one after the other from the primeval Ātman, who does not play very active part in creation (for, we are not told that the Ātman creates. Cf. the use of the term *sambhūtaḥ*). The Ātman is not the creator but all 'that-come-to-be' are manifested through itself and not outside it. Thus, coming into existence and vanishing of the ākāśa (ether) etc. are different manifestations or forms of the Truth or Reality (ātman) which remains unchanged in essence. *Ātman* is, thus, in this theory only the source of the rise and disappearance of the objective universe and not a consciously exerting or active Creator. The *akartṛtva* or 'non-doing' nature of the Self in the absolutist theory is retained here but only the manifestations or creations are explained by way of illustrations (as for example those given below) as objective and not ephemeral. At the time of destruction, again, the earth would be dissolved in water, water in fire, fire in air, air in ether and ether in the eternal Ātman.[1] Lastly, we find a realistic and intelligible explanation of the origin and the destruction of the physical universe in this theory as opposed to the predominant absolutist theory of creation revealed in the Upaniṣads. Few more examples to this theory might not be out of place.

---

[1] हिरण्मयेन पात्रेण सत्यस्य पिहितं मुखम्, *Īśopaniṣad* 15.

[2] *Bṛhadāraṇyakopaniṣad* 2.1.20.

[3] तस्माद्वा एतस्मादात्मन आकाशः सम्भूतः । आकाशाद्वायुः, वायोरग्निः, अग्नेरापः, अद्भ्यः पृथ्वी । *Taittirīyopaniṣad* 2.1.

(1) "As a spider stretches forth and gathers together its threads, as herbs grow out of the earth, as from the living man come out the hair, so from the imperishable comes out the universe."[2]

(2) "As from a well-lit fire, sparks of like nature to it, arise thousandfold, so dear one, from the imperishable go forth manifold beings and return into it again. From Him is produced breath, mind and all the senses, ether, air, light, water and earth which is the support of all the preceding four."[3]

IV. The Doctrine of Prāṇa

The concept of the absolute represents the supreme reality or that phase of reality which is transcendental, immutable, uncreated and undefined. But the Upaniṣads do recognise also another phase that consists of the principle of creation or activity. Whatever is, i.e., all this world issues forth form the moving Prāṇa.[4] All that is created here and in the heaven is under the control of prāṇa.[5] Just as all the spokes of a wheel are centred in the navel, similarly

---

1. *Taittirīyopaniṣad* 3.1. Cf. also य एकोऽवर्णो बहुधा शक्तियोगाद्वर्णाननेकान्निहितार्थो दधाति । वि चैति चान्ते विश्वमादौ स देवः स नो बुद्ध्या शुभया संयुनक्तु ।। *Śvetāśvataropaniṣad* 4.1.
2. यथोर्णनाभिः सृजते गृह्णते च यथा पृथिव्यामोषधयः संभवन्ति । यथा सतः पुरुषात्केशलोमानि तथाऽक्षरात्संभवतीह विश्वम् ।। *Muṇḍakopaniṣad* 1.1.7.
3. तदेतत्सत्यं यथा सुदीप्तात्पावकाद्विस्फुलिङ्गा : सहस्रशः प्रभवन्ते सरूपाः । तथाऽक्षराद्विविधा. सौम्य भावाः प्रजायन्ते तत्र चैवापि यन्ति ।। *Muṇḍakopaniṣad* 2 1.1.
4. यदिदं किञ्च जगत्सर्वं प्राण एजति निःसृतम् । महद्भयं वज्रमुद्यतं य एतद्विदुरमृतास्ते भवन्ति ।। *Kaṭhopaniṣad* 6.2.
5. प्राणेस्येदं वशे सर्वं त्रिदिवे यत्प्रतिष्ठितम् । *Praśnopaniṣad* 2.13.

all these beings, and in fact, everything that exists is centred in prāṇa.[1] In some of the highly suggestive and mythological accounts of the Upaniṣads prāṇa is established as supreme lord of all the elements namely ether, fire, water and earth[2] as well as of the organs of sense namely speech, mind, eye and ear[3] and the deities[4] of the regions in the universe. All the beings, elements etc. also regularly dissolve into the prāṇa.[5] This indicates the metaphysical importance attached to the concept of prāṇa in the Upaniṣads. Agni (or prāṇa)[6] is called *Jātavedas* (i.e. knower of all that is created) and according to further interpretation all created things know it because it is the source of and remains in direct touch with them all.[7] It also exists eternally in every cycle of creation, it is behind each and every manifestation.[8] Thus, it is clear that while Ātman or Brahman is the transcendental aspect of reality, prāṇa or agni is its creative or universally immanent aspect in the Upaniṣads.

Cosmic pulsation expresses itself in the concept of prāna, i.e., that of the universal rhythmic movement of expansion and contraction.[9] In this connection, it is interesting to note that the *Praśnopaniṣad*[10] says that Prajāpati performed penance in order to create and thereafter generated a twin principle (mithuna) comprising of prāṇa and *rayi*, the sun and the moon, and it is their comingling which leads to the exuberance of creation. Thus, the month is conceived as the creative agent (*Prajāpati*) of which the dark fortnight is rayi and the bright one prāṇa.[1] Again, the two are also compared to night and day[2] respectively. The dark and the bright are the two movements which signify the basic law of creation and pervade all through—life and death, waking and sleeping, work and rest, youth and age, day and night. After referring to all the manifestations or creations known either as subjects or objects in the three states of waking, dreaming and deep-sleep which we may compare to the bright or visible half or prāṇa as has been pointed to earlier, the fourth facet or leg of the Ātman or reality is called invisible, beyond all manifestation, transcendent, the unusable, the end of all existence, the good and the non-dual which we may further liken to the rayi principle as pointed to above.[3]

---

[1] यथा वा अरा नाभौ समर्पिता एवमस्मिन्प्राणे सर्वं समर्पितं प्राण: प्राणेन । *Chāndogyopaniṣad* 7.15.1.

[2] *Praśnopaniṣad* 2.1.12.

[3] *Chāndogyopaniṣad* 5.1.6-15.

[4] *Kauśitakyupaniṣad* 3.2.9.

[5] *Chāndogyopaniṣad* 1.2.5; ibid, 4.3.3.

[6] *Praśnopaniṣad* 4 3.

[7] Cf. *Nirukta* by Yāska 7.5.

[8] Ibid.

[9] Cf. प्राणो वै समुञ्चनप्रसारणम् । *Śatapathabrāhmaṇa* 8.1.4.10 and also the concepts of प्राणन and अपानन, expiration and inspiration, belonging to प्राण, the life vibration, referred to in *Ṛgveda* 10.189.2.

[10] *Praśnopaniṣad* 1 3.13.

Prāṇa is identified with the principles of life (*āyuḥ*), consciousness (*prajñā*) and the ultimate reality (ātman) which is ageless and immortal and which does not increase by good actions nor diminish by bad actions.[4] Indeed, in the words of Prof. Ranade[5] *it thus comes out that prāṇa is life from the biological point of view, consciousness from the psychological point of view, and Ātman from the metaphysical point of view. This is verily a philosophical apothesis of prāṇa.*

---

[1] Cf. the concept of रजस् (i.e. the principle of motion) as शुक्ल and कृष्ण in the *Saṁhitās* (e.g. in *Ṛgveda* 6.9.1 and 3.5 5).

[2] These two become शिव and शक्ति in the *tantras* in which the symbols of Sun and Moon have been worked in greater detail.

[3] See f n. 10 on page 44.

[4] *Kauśītakyupaniṣad* 3.2-9.

[5] See *A Constructive Survey of Upanishadic Philosophy* by R. D. Ranade, p. 92.

We can, therefore, say that the Upaniṣads recognise a principle of unity-in-difference at the basis of creation of which prāṇa is one chief component. Prāṇa is the manifest, finite, moving, transitory, existing-only-in-name aspect of Brahman or reality, wheras its other aspect is unmanifest, immortal, unmoved and even the Truth of the truth (i. e. really true as opposed to the apprent)[1]. Thus, we see how in the process of creation the absolute or the transcendent comes to be known as the many or as the Universe according to the doctrine of the prāṇa as revealed in the Upaniṣads.

V. The Concept of Ether

The Sanskrit word for the so-called elements is '*bhūta*', i.e., what has become, what has actually come to exist or become a matter of fact. In other words the one which was latent as existence (*bhū*), has become obvious or manifest. The potential, formless, unmanifest matter adopts forms and, thus, becomes manifest in these elements (though these are still in their elementary state). This will be clear from the following discussion about them.

It is maintained in the Upaniṣads that ākāśa or ether is so-called because it is the medium through which light shines, or because all the heavenly lights like the Sun and others shine through it.[2] According to sage Pravahaṇa, all beings are verily born from the ether and merge into the ether and the ether alone is greater than these. Ether is the last refuge or habitat (*parā yaṇam*).[3] Ether is identified as the omnipresent and eternal Brahman[1] and source of Air.[2] As the primeval pre-evolute matter it is stated to exist perfectly still[3] and without motion which we know, characterizes matter in the processes of combination and disintegration. It is further interesting to note the true conception of ether reached in the last discourse of *Chāndogya Upaniṣad.*[4] It is maintained that "the ether is verily made of name and form. That which is beyond this couple of name and form is Brahman. It is immortal." Truly, we can conclude that ether has been conceived as primeval, eternal and motionless material out of which after successive[5] transformations manifests this multitudinous diversity of the physical universe. However, there is an unknown controller or Conscious Energy which controls all these elements (*bhūtāni*) and worlds (*lokam paraṁ ca lokam*) from within, and which alone is real in the absolute sense.[6]

---

[1] द्वे वाव ब्रह्मणो रूपे मूर्तं चैवामूर्तं च मर्त्यं चामृतं च स्थितं च यच्च सच्च त्यच्च । etc. *Bṛhadāraṇyakopaniṣad* 2.3.1-6.

[2] आ समन्तात् काशन्ते दीपयन्ते सूर्य्यादयो यत्र । Cf. the modern scientific concept of ether with this discription. See also *Hindu Philosophers on Evolution* by Balkrishna, pp. 45-48.

[3] अस्य लोकस्य का गतिरित्याकाश इति होवाच सर्वाणि ह वा इमानि भूतान्याकाशादेवा समुत्पद्यन्त आकाशं प्रत्यस्तं यन्त्याकाशो ह्येवैभ्यो ज्यायानाकाशः परायणम् । *Chāndogyopaniṣad* 1.9.1.

VI. The Concept of Air

Raikva believed that air is the final absorbent of all things. According to him[7] "the air (vāyu) verily is the ultimate reality (*saṁvarga*) of all. When fire is extinguished it goes to the air, when the sun sets it goes to the air, when the moon sets it goes to the air, when the waters dry up they go to the air : thus verily is air the final absorbent of all things whatsoever." We can deduce from the

---

1. *Bṛhadāraṇyakopaniṣad* 5.1; *Chāndogyopaniṣad* 3.12.7-9; Cf. √बृह>ब्रह्मन् i.e., that which swells or evolves. Brahman, thus, denotes etymologically the unmanifest source from whom grow, evolve or emanate all that have come to exist (Cf. √भू सत्तायां + क्त = भूत)
2. *Bṛhadāraṇyakopaniṣad* 5.1.
3. *Chāndogyopaniṣad* 1.5.
4. आकाशो वै नाम नामरूपयोर्निर्वहिता ते यदन्तरा तद्ब्रह्म तदमृतम् । *Chāndogyopaniṣad* 8.14.
5. See f.n. 3 on page 42.
6. *Bṛhadāraṇyakopaniṣad* 3.7. Cf. also f. n. 4 above.
7. *Chāndogyopaniṣad* 4.3.1-2.

above that the air is also the beginning of all things. This doctrine of Raikva is crude as absorption of all things in the air is not intelligentally or logically worked out. Still, his boldness and independent approach to the problem of creation is amply proved even by the simple fact that both water and fire (which many of his contemporaries regarded as the material substratum of all things) are stated to dissolve in the air.

VII. The Concept of Earth

The *Chāndogya Upaniṣad* opens with the statement that the earth constiutes the essence of all these existents ; water is the essence of earth, the annual herbs of the water, and man is the essence of the vegetables.[1] The advancement of the theory of earth as the primeval matter or origin sounds strange enough and seems to mark the crude imagination of the early Vedic speculations. The description above as such is lacking in coherent logic, scientific accuracy and convincing arguments.

VIII. The Concept of Water

The concept of water is very much predominant from the time of the Samhitā itself. As such it is declared in an Upaniṣad that "this non-being was verily water and full of motion like water."[2] Again, "all these beings are merely water. It is just water solidified, that is this earth, that is the atmosphere, that is the sky, that is the mountains, that is gods and man, that is animals and birds, grass, trees, beasts, together with worms, flies, and ants, all these are just water solidified."[3] Then, Yājñavalkya in his well-known discussion with the lady philosopher Gārgī, echoes at the very outest that "all this world is woven warp and woof on water"[1] Elsewhere, we find the first cause of the universe propounded as water : "In the beginning this world was just water. That water created the satya or Truth.[2] Satya created Brahman, Brahman created Prajāpati. And he (i. e., Prajāpati) created gods in his turn."[3] It is remarkable here that even the concept of God as creator of water itself has been cast off and the primeval waters alone are endowed with the power to evolve the phenomenal multiplicity.

---

[1] एपां भूतानां पृथ्वी रसः ....*Chāndogyopaniṣad* 1.1.2.

[2] *Bṛhajjābālopaniṣad* 1.1.

[3] *Chāndogyopaniṣad* 7.10.1; Also Cf. Bhṛgu's doctrine in Chapter 183 of the *Śāntiparva* (*Mahābhārata*).

The primeval waters are spoken of as the universe of Brahman and the soul.[4] In *Kaṭhopaniṣad*, again, the puruṣa is known as existing before the primeval waters[5] and the latter are to be understood by "aditi" the sustainer of the god that springs forth together with all the elements to life.[6] Primeval waters are the product of the Ātman dwelling in the Heart[7] (in which the heaven and the earth are confined).[8] Waters are often described as the chief material which the Ātman creates in the beginning for further creation.[9] The Ṛgvedic

---

1. अथ हैनं गार्गी वाचवक्नवी पप्रच्छ याज्ञवल्क्येति होवाच यदिदं सर्वमप्स्वोतं च प्रोतं च । *Chāndogyopaniṣad* 3.6.1.
2. सत्यम् in this context is later (Cf. *Bṛhadāraṇyakopaniṣad* 5.5.1) explained as ultimate "concrete" existent : Cf. the concept of भूतानि or 'the existents' as व्यक्तमध्यानि as well as अव्यक्तादीनि and अव्यक्तनिधनानि in *Bhagwadgītā* 2.28; See also lines 12-25 on p. 77 of R. D. Ranade's *A Constructive Survey of the Upanishads.*
3. *Bṛhadāraṇyakopaniṣad* 5.5.1.
4. *Kauśītakyupaniṣad* 1.7.
5. यः पूर्वं तपसो जातमद्भ्यः पूर्वमजायत । गुहां प्रविश्य तिष्ठन्तं यो भूतेभिर्व्यपश्यत । *Kaṭhopaniṣad* 2.1.6.
6. या प्राणेन संभवत्यदितिर्देवतामयी गुहां प्रविश्य तिष्ठन्ती या भूतेभिर्व्यजायत ॥ *Kaṭhopaniṣad* 2.1.7.
7. Ibid.
8. *Chāndogyopaniṣad* 8.1.3.
9. Cf. the concept of हिरण्यगर्भ प्रजापति in *Ṛgveda* 10.81, 82; *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa* 6.1.1; *Aitareyopaniṣad* 1.1. *Īśopaniṣad* 4; *Mahānārāyaṇopaniṣad* 1.4.

concept of *Hiraṇyagarbha* is also several times referred to in the Upaniṣads according to which Hiraṇyagarbha came forth as the first born of creation from the primeval waters which were created by the first principle.[1]

IX. The Concept of Fire

In a beautiful episode of the *Chāndogya Upaniṣad* King Jaivāli declares everything to have originated from fire. Yonder region, clouds, earth, man and woman all are verily fire.[2] *Kaṭhopaniṣad* also tells us that fire having entered the universe assumed all forms.[3]

But the most advanced theory of creation involving fire as a chief contributory is to be found in what Uddālaka says in the *Chāndogya Upaniṣad*.[4] The evolution of three elements –fire, water and earth from one another and ultimately from the self-existent i.e., Brahman, is described and established systematically : "He (the *sat* or Plenum proposed—I will be many, will propagate myself. Accordingly He created heat (*Tejas*). This heat proposed—I will become many, will propagate myself. Accordingly He created the waters (*āpaḥ*). Therefore, when a man feels the heat or perspires, water is produced from the heat. These waters proposed—we will become many, will propagate ourselves. Accordingly they created food (*annam*). Therefore, when it rains, abundant food is produced, for from waters is pro-

---

[1] Ibid ; *Ṛgveda* 10.121.1 ; *Aitareyopaniṣad* 3.3. ; *Bṛhadāraṇyakopaniṣad* 4.4.4 ; See page 199 of *The Philosophy of the Upanishads* by Deussen ; *Kauśitakyupaniṣad* 1.7; Among the later Upaniṣads mention may be made of *Nārāyaṇopaniṣad* 1; *Atharvaśiras Upaniṣad* 6; *Piṇḍopaniṣad* 1; *Garuḍopaniṣad* 1; *Mahānārāyaṇopaniṣad* 4; *and Nṛsiṁhottaropaniṣad* 9 in which this concept puts on the garb of the mythological Nārāyaṇa etc.

[2] *Chāndogyopaniṣad* 5.3.8.

[3] अग्निर्यथैको भुवनं प्रविष्टो रूपं रूपं प्रतिरूपो बभूव *Kaṭhopaniṣad* 2.9. Cf. the close affinity between these lines and *Ṛgveda* 6.47.18.

[4] *Chāndogyopaniṣad* 6.2.

14213
राष्ट्रीय संस्कृत संस्थान
जयपुर परिसर, जयपुर
पुस्तकालय
क्रमांक... ...

duced food for man's eating." Then, the self-existent is said to enter as individual soul (jīvātman) into the three deities or elements created. Furthermore, the *sat* or self-existent is said to have made these elements threefold by alloying each of them with equal and constituent portions of the other two. Thus, the created fire contains one half of the original tejas, one fourth of the amount of the original (or pure) water and one fourth of the amount of the unadulterated earth. Similar is the case with the worldly or created water and earth. Thus, also, for example, it is shown of fire, sun, moon and lightening, that the red in them consists of heat, the white of water, the black of food. Evidently these pure elements and alloyed elements in this theory possess the earliest germ of the later concepts of the pure substances (*sūkṣmabhūta* or *tanmātrā*) and gross elements (*sthūlabhūta* or *mahābhūta*). It is interesting, however, to note in this connection how *Praśnopaniṣad*[1] first draws this distinction as to that between earth and earth-substance, water and water-substance, heat and heat-substance, the ether and the the ether-substance. The concepts of pṛthivīmātrā, āpomātrā, tejomātrā, vāyumātrā and ākāśamātrā were comprehended under the term *tanmātrā* i.e., 'subsisting from that alone' in the later Upaniṣads.[2]

X. The Concept of Organic Nature

Speaking from the highest viewpoint the Upaniṣads find the universe and Brahman as essentially one and the same reality, but in order to intellectually explain the concept of the relation as seems to exist between cause and effect, and that of the creation of the universe to the common man, who has not realized the highest truth they rather pose to represent a creation of the universe, so very vast and varied and hence inexplicable, in their own way. That is also why sṛṣṭi or

---

1. *Praśnopaniṣad* 4.8.
2. *Maitryupaniṣad* 3.2; *Prāṇāgnihotropaniṣad* 4; Cf. also how the number of the elements increases to five (*Taittirīyopaniṣad* 2.1.); Also, the same process of compounding is later on extended to पञ्चीकरण (See *Vedāntasāra*, for example).

creation standing for a discharge, a setting free or emission, an emergence or emanation of the universe from the Brahman in the Upaniṣadic philosophy presents a contradiction to the professed immutability and attributelessness of Reality or Brahman.

Thus, it is said that the Brahman himself having created the universe has entered up to the finger tips.[1] This shows a remarkable ingenuity and genuine effort towards a compromise between the concept of the sole reality of the Brahman on the one hand and the multiplicity of the practical universe on the other.

In this way, we find that the Ātman having created has entered into the three deities (i.e., the elements) with this living self (*jīvenātmanā* i.e., as the individual soul) and separated thence name and form.[2] Again, having created the organisms as citadels (puras) the Brahman enters into them as citizen, i.e., as soul.[3] As individual he has entered into all living creatures, plants,[4] animals, men, gods etc.[5] *Aitareya Upaniṣad* thus enumerates the several gods, elements, lights, creatures and the insects, the motionless, the world regions and this entire universe as being equal[6] to this (consciousness or Ātman) principle

---

1. *Bṛhadāraṇyakopaniṣad* 1.4.7. Cf. *Taittirīyopaniṣad* 2.6.
2. तासां त्रिवृतं त्रिवृतमेकैकां करवाणीति सेयं देवतेमास्तिस्रो देवता अनेनैव जीवेनात्मनानुप्रविश्य नामरूपे व्याकरोत् । *Chāndogyopaniṣad* 6.3.3.
3. तदेतदृषिः पश्यन्नवोचत् । पुरश्च ते द्विपदः पुरश्च ते चतुष्पदः । पुरः स पक्षी भूत्वा पुरः पुरुष आविशदिति । स वा अयं पुरुषः सर्वासु पूर्षु पुरिशयो नैनेन किंचनानावृतं नैनेन किंचनासंवृतम् । *Bṛhadāraṇyakopaniṣad* 2.5.18.
4. *Chāndogyopaniṣad* 6.11.
5. तस्माच्च देवा बहुधा संप्रभूताः साध्या मनुष्याः पशवो वयांसि । प्राणापानौ व्रीहियवौ तपश्च श्रद्धा सत्यं ब्रह्मचर्यं विधिश्च । *Muṇḍakopniṣad* 2.1.7; Cf. Also *Ṛgveda* 10.90 and *Atharvaveda* 11.4.3.
6. यद्वेव समः प्लुषिणा समो मशकेन समो नागेन सम एभिस्त्रिभिर्लोकैः समोऽनेन सर्वेण तस्माद्वेव सामाश्नुते साम्नः सायुज्यं । *Bṛhadāraṇyakopaniṣad* 1.3.22.

itself.[1] Soul's migration extends to the plant world[2] and gods[3] also according to work or knowledge.[4]

XI. *The Concept of Puruṣa*

The *puruṣa sūkta*[5] of Ṛgveda, it seems, has inspired the creation myth occuring at the beginning of the *Aitareyopaniṣad.*[6] The myth occurs thus : "In the beginning the Ātman alone was the universe ; He deliberated - I will create worlds." Accordingly, after he had created the earth and atmosphere, the waters above and below, he drew forth the puruṣa from the waters, and gave him shape. Brooding over these waters they opened 'like an egg', the mouth, nose, eyes etc. of which are then developed, and from them the eight psychic organs, and from these in turn agni, vāyu, āditya etc. as the eight guardians of the universe, who finally take up their abode in men as speech, breath, sight etc. Although the human body is thus animated by the organs of sense that spring from the puruṣa, it can, however, only exist after the creator 'through the fissure of the skull' has entered into it as the individual soul. The spirit of this myth thus resembles greatly the hymn of the Ṛgveda referred to above. "But the puruṣa that in Ṛgveda had been the first principle, becomes here a power dependent on the Ātman ; and similarly the organs of man's soul are ascribed to the puruṣa but the soul itself to the Ātman".[7]

---

1. Cf. *Aitareyopaniṣad* 1 and the commentary of Śaṁkarācārya on it.
2. योनिमन्ये प्रपद्यन्ते शरीरत्वाय देहिनः । स्थाणुमन्येऽनुसंयन्ति यथाकर्म यथाश्रुतम् *Kaṭhopaniṣad* 2.2.7.
3. तद्यथा पेशस्कारी पेशसो मात्रामपदायान्यन्नवतरं कल्याणतरं रूपं तनुत एवमेवायमात्मेदं शरीरं निहत्याविद्यां गमयित्वान्यन्नवतरं कल्याणतरं रूपं कुरुते पित्र्यं वा गान्धर्वं वा दैवं वा प्राजापत्यं वा ब्राह्मं वान्येषां वा भूतानाम् । *Bṛhadāraṇyakopaniṣad* 4.4.4.
4. *Chāndogyopaniṣad* 6.10.2; *Kauśītakyupaniṣad* 1.2.
5. *Ṛgveda* 10.90.
6. *Aitareyopaniṣad* 1.1.4.
7. See *The Philosophy of the Upanishads* by Deussen, p. 188.

XII. The Concept of Being and Non-Being

Sometimes the Upaniṣads suggest that non-being was the primeval existent. So the *Taittirīya Upaniṣad* tells us that at the beginning of all things what existed was non-being. From it was born being. Being shaped itself of its own accord. It is thus that it is called the well-made or self-made.[1] *Bṛhadāraṇyakopaniṣad* states thus :

> *In the beginning verily nothing was existent but that everything was covered by 'Death' or 'Hunger', for Hunger is verily Death. Death made up its mind, let me have a self, and thus worshipping he began to move. From his worshipping were born the waters. The froth of the waters solidified and became earth. Death toiled on the earth, and as a result of his toil, fire was produced.*[2]

Chāndogya Upaniṣad connects the philosophy of non-being with the myth of the universal egg. So it is said "What existed in the beginning was non-being. It then converted itself into being. It grew and became a vast egg.[3] It lay in that position for the period of a year, and then it broke open. Its two parts were, one of gold and the other of silver. The silvery part became the earth, and the golden part became the heaven. The thick membrane became the mountains ; the thin membrane became the clouds ; the arteries of the egg became the rivers of the world ; the fluid in its interior became the ocean ;

---

[1] असद्वा इदमग्र आसीत् । ततो वै सदजायत । तदात्मानं स्वयमकुरुत । तस्मात्तत्सुकृतमुच्यत इति । यद्वै तत्सुकृतम् । *Taittirīyopaniṣad* 2.7.

[2] नैवेह किंचनाग्र आसीन्मृत्युनैवेदमावृतमासीत् । अशनाययाऽशनाया हि मृत्युस्तन्मनोऽकुरुतात्मन्वी स्यामिति । सोऽर्चंन्नचरत्तस्यार्चंते वै मे कमभूदिति तदेवार्कस्यार्कत्वं कं ह वा अस्मै भवति य एवमेतदर्कस्यार्कत्वं वेद ॥ आपो वा अर्कस्तद्यदपां शर आसीत्तत्समहन्यत । सा पृथिव्यभवत्तस्यामश्राम्यत्तस्य तप्तस्य तेजोरसो निरवर्तताग्निः । *Bṛhadāraṇyakopaniṣad* 2.1.2; Cf. *Ṛgveda* 10.129 where it is said that in the beginning there was neitber Being nor Non-being, but that what existed was only an ocean of Night ; also Cf. *Taittirīya Brāhmaṇa* 2.8.9.

[3] Cf. Also : अन्तरिक्षोदरः कोशो भूमिबुध्नो न जीर्यति दिशो ह्यस्य स्रक्तयो द्यौरस्योत्तरं बिलं स एष कोशो वसुधानस्तस्मिन्विश्वमिदं श्रितम् । *Chāndogyopaniṣad* 3.15.1,

while what came out of the egg was the sun. When the sun was born, shouts of hurrah arose."[1] The concept of cosmic egg here sounds original and even scientific to some extent as we know that the contraction of the earth's crust (Cf. the outer membrane of the mundane egg) brought about elevations and depressions of the sea floor and its surface.

Non-being in such instances does not mean that nothing existed in the beginning. It only suggests that the world of creation was in its original state unmanifest, because, non-being cannot by any stretch of imagination change itself, or create, or be the primeval ground of being (especially the diverse universe).[2] Again, in all these instances the manner of creation from the Non-being evidently brings home to us the existence of something indistinct, unmainfest (*Avyākṛta*), undeveloped and undifferentiated as the background of the world which became manifestated or differentiated by name and form.[3]

The Upaniṣad itself[4] criticises the non-being hypothesis about the primeval existent : "How could it possibly be so, how could Being

---

1. आदित्यो ब्रह्मेत्यादेशस्तस्योपव्याख्यानमसदेवेदमग्र आसीत् । तत्सदासीत्तत्समभवत्तदाण्डं निरवर्तत । तत्संवत्सरस्य मात्रामशयत । तन्निरभिद्यत । त आंडकपाले रजतं च सुवर्णं चाभवताम् । तद्यद्रजतं सेयं पृथिवी यत्सुवर्णं सा द्यौर्यज्जरायु ते पर्वता यदुल्बं स मेघो नीहारे या धमनयस्ता नद्यो यद्वास्तेयमुदकं स समुद्रः । अथ यत्तदजायत सोऽसावादित्यस्तं जायमानं घोषा उलूलवोऽनूदतिष्ठन्त्सर्वाणि च भूतानि सर्वे च कामाः । तस्मात्तस्योदयं प्रति प्रत्यायनं प्रति घोषा उलूलवोऽनूत्तिष्ठन्ति सर्वाणि च भूतानि सर्वे च कामाः । *Chāndogyopaniṣad* 3.19.1-3.
2. Cf. असदिति व्याकृतनामरूपविशेषविपरीतरूपमव्याकृतं ब्रह्मोच्यते । न पुनरत्यन्तमेवासत् । न ह्यसतः सज्जन्मास्ति । इदमिति नामरूपविशेषवद्व्याकृतं जगत् अग्रे पूर्वं प्रागुत्पत्तेर्ब्रह्मैवासच्छब्दवाच्यमासीत् ततोऽसतो वै सत्प्रविभक्तनामरूपविशेषमजायतोत्पन्नम् । Śaṁkarācārya on *Taittirīyopaniṣad* 2.7.
3. तद्धेदं तर्ह्यव्याकृतमासीत्तन्नामरूपाभ्यामेव व्याक्रियतासौनामायमिदं रूपं इति तदिदमप्येतर्हि नामरूपाभ्यामेव व्याक्रियतेऽसौनामायमिदं रूपं इति स एष इह प्रविष्टः । आ नखाग्रेभ्यो यथा क्षुरः क्षुरधानेऽवहितः स्यादविश्वंभरो वा विश्वंभरकुलाये तं न पश्यन्ति । अकृत्स्नो हि स प्राणन्नेव प्राणो नाम भवति । वदन्वाक्पश्यंश्चक्षुः श्रृण्वञ्श्रोत्र मन्वानो मनस्तान्यस्यैतानि कर्मनामान्येव । *Bṛhadāraṇyakopaniṣad* 1.4.7.
4. सदेव सौम्येदमग्र आसीदेकमेवाद्वितीयम् । तद्धैक आहुरसदेवेदमग्र आसीदेकमेवाद्वितीयं तस्मादसतः

come out of Non-being, existence from non-existence? It is necessary for us to suppose that at the beginning verily all this was Being, and it was alone and without a second. This primeval being reflected, let me be many—let me produce; having bethought thus to itself it produced fire...." Further, it is said that from it were produced waters and they created the earth (food or matter) and the Upaniṣad goes on to formulate the famous *Trivṛtkaraṇa* doctrine which we have already discussed.[1] The being in this case is endowed with consciousness, will and energy[2] (jñāna, icchā and kriyā) the three functions which are demonstrated in his creative process above. This is indeed a major and praiseworthy theory advanced for the solution of the problem of creation.

XIII. The Concept of Personal God

The existence of the early Vedic gods like Indra, Varuṇa etc. is not denied in the Upaniṣads, though here they are shown like ordinary human beings and as created by and dependent on the Ātman.[3] The gods, however, retain immortality.[4] Not only their power[5] but their knowledge[6] also is dependent on Brahman. Another notable charac-

---

सज्जायते । कुतस्तु सौम्यैवं स्यादिति होवाच कथमसतः सज्जायेतेति । सत्त्वेव सौम्येदमग्र आसीदेकमेवाद्वितीयम् । *Chāndogyopaniṣad* 6.2.2.

[1] See Section IX earlier.

[2] Cf. the oft-repeated terms जीवेनात्मना प्रविश्य, तदैक्षत and सः तपोऽतप्यत respectively in the Upaniṣads. Cf. also *Ṛgveda* 10.129 where, too, these three are discernable. See pp. 31-36 in this connection for a full discussion.

[3] स यथोर्णनाभिस्तन्तुनोच्चरेद्यथाग्नेः क्षुद्रा विस्फुलिङ्गा व्युच्चरन्त्येवमेवास्मादात्मनः सर्वे देवाः सर्वाणि भूतानि व्युच्चरन्ति । *Bṛhadāraṇyakopaniṣad* 2.1.20; *Kaṭhopaniṣad* 2.1.9; *Aitareyopaniṣad* 1.1.3.

[4] यच्छ्रेयसो देवानसृजताथ यन्मर्त्यः सन्नमृतानसृजत तस्मादतिसृष्टिः । *Bṛhadāraṇyakopaniṣad* 1.4.6.

[5] *Kenopaniṣad* 14-28; *Bṛhadāraṇyakopaniṣad* 3.7; *Taittirīyopaniṣad* 2.8; *Kaṭhopaniṣad* 2.3.3; Kauśītakyupaniṣad 1.5.

[6] *Chāndogyopaniṣad* 8.7.1-4.

terstic of Upaniṣadic theism is its monism. Anyone having known Brahman (which is no other than his Ātman) becomes Brahman itself.[1] Another use made of these individual gods is to make them appear as symbolical representatives of the Ātman.[2]

The omnipotent, eternal and omnipresent Ātman is celebrated as the inner guide (antaryāmin) in all the parts and forces of nature and of mankind.[3] Though imperishable (*akṣara*) and untouched by good and bad actions, at its bidding the sun and the moon hold their positions.[4] Ātman dwelling within the heart is the chief Lord, the governor of the universe who guides and protects the smooth working of the different parts of the universe.[5] The knowledge of this Ātman depends on the lord's grace.[6]

It is in *Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad* that God and soul are clearly distinguished[7] from one another, although the original identity is not denied,[8] and, the removal of this illusion of difference between them appears there as a grace of the supreme god.[9] This universe is, thus, declared the māyā or illusion caused by the lord.[10] Again, the chief function of Īśvara or God is described to be as of bringing the actions (karmans) to maturity and apportioning their fruit to the souls

---

[1] *Chāndogyopaniṣad* 8.12.6; *Bṛhadāraṇyakopaniṣad* 1.4.10.

[2] Indra in *Bṛhadāraṇyakopaniṣad* 1.5.12; *Aitareyopaniṣad* 1.3.14; *Kauṣītakyupaniṣad* 2.6.3.1; Varuṇa in *Taittirīyopaniṣad* 3 1; Prajāpati in *Chāndogyopaniṣad* 8.7.

[3] *Bṛhadāraṇyakopaniṣad* 3.7.3-23.

[4] Ibid, 3.8.9.

[5] Ibid, 4.4.22.

[6] *Kaṭhopaniṣad* 1.2.23; *Śvetāśvataropaniṣad* 3.20; *Mahānārāyaṇopaniṣad* 1.10.

[7] Cf. also (as light and shadow) ऋतं पिबन्तौ सुकृतस्य लोके गुहां प्रविष्टौ परमे परार्धे । छायातपौ ब्रह्मविदो वदन्ति पञ्चाग्नयो ये च त्रिणाचिकेताः । *Kaṭhopaniṣad* 1.3.1.

[8] *Śvetāsvataropaniṣad* 4.6,7 (Repeated in *Muṇḍakopaniṣad* 3.1.1,2); Cf. also *Ṛgveda* 1.164.20.

[9] *Śvetāśvataropaniṣad* 1.6.

[10] Ibid, 4.10.

(jīvas).[1] The Īśvara is endowed with divine grace for the highest good of the jīvas. "Some people say" says the Upaniṣad, "that it is time, others the nature, others necessity, others chance, others the elements, yet others the person, still others the combination of these and yet a few others the Ātman, which is the cause of all things whatsoever."[2] All these theories are criticized in the *Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad* and it puts forth a constructive scheme of śaivite theism in explanation of the creation problem. God is the very time of time, Death to the very god of death;[3] Nature itself is matured by the presence of God inside it.[4] Necessity or chance are respectively too fatalistic and too unphilosophical explanations. Elements are God's garment and it is due to His supreme skill in work that earth, water, fire, air and ether were created.[5] Their combination cannot be the origin of creation because we must have an Eternal Being who is the primal cause of their combination.[6] Īśvara, being the creator, is in eternal union with māyā which is His own power,[7] is properly speaking the 'means whereby' the Great Magician (māyin) operates.[8] In fact, His supreme power is said to be of many kinds : knowledge, will and action are natural to Him.[9] He is the supreme Godhead to whose power is due the whirling round of the wheel of the universe.[10] He is the supreme cause—the self-subsisting mover of the unmoving manifold and causes the one primal seed to sprout in infinite ways.[11]

---

[1] This concept of the Almighty Īśvara is still popular in Indian Tradition.
[2] *Śvetāśvataropaniṣad* 1.2.
[3] Ibid, 6.2; ibid, 6.16; ibid, 3.10.
[4] Ibid, 5.5.
[5] Ibid, 6.2; ibid, 6.11.
[6] Ibid, 6.1.
[7] Ibid, 6.8.
[8] *Indian Historical Quarterly*, Vol. XI, Sept. 1935.
[9] स्वाभाविकी ज्ञानबलक्रिया च । *Śvetāśvataropaniṣad* 1.3.
[10] Ibid, 3.2, ibid, 6.1.
[11] Ibid, 6.9; ibid, 6.12.

The assigning of the above personal attributes to a Lord (Creator) seems to have been inspired by an unconscious recognition of the apparent 'reality' and richness of the empirical experience. Hence, although the theism of *Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad* is attached to the cult of Śiva, Viṣṇu, Nṛsiṁha etc. in the later Upaniṣads,[1] yet even in them the original idealism (i.e. the sole reality of the absolute) which dissolves the Universe and gods in Ātman reveals itself. For example, in *Nṛsiṁhottaratāpanīyopaniṣad* the fourth (*turīya*) or highest state of the soul is represented as the abyss of the eternal unity in which all distinctions of being and knowing vanish, the entire expanse of the universe is obliterated, "and even Īśvara (the eternal god) is swallowed up by the turīya (fourth)."[2]

XIV. The Concept of Dualism

In the *Praśnopaniṣad* Pippalāda conceives the notion of a duality of primary existence, viz. that of *rayi* and *prāṇa*, or matter and spirit (created first by the Creator after penance). Thus, it is said that moon is matter—while the sun is spirit, the dark half of the month is matter—while the bright one is spirit, the night is matter while the day is spirit and so on. It was in this way that the Creator was able to create all the dual existence.[3] Such duality apparently seems mythological and its real contribution is made explicit in our discussion of the concept of Prāṇa.

At another place the Creator is said to create in the same way and, thus, become Himself both the manifest and the unmanifest, the defined and the undefined, the supported and the unsupported, the conscious and the unconscious and the true and the false.[4] This

---

1. *Maitrāyaṇyupaniṣad* 6.8.
2. *Nṛsiṁhottaratāpanīyopaniṣad* 1.
3. *Praśnopaniṣad* 1.3-13.
4. सोऽकामयत । बहु स्यां प्रजायेयेति । स तपोऽतप्यत । स तपस्तप्त्वा । इदं सर्वमसृजत । यदिदं किञ्च । तत्सृष्ट्वा । तदेवानुप्राविशत् । तदनुप्रविश्य । सच्च त्यच्चाभवत् । निरुक्तं चानिरुक्तं च । निलयनं

description sounds more philosophical and we can see in it the earliest seed of the later concept of *satkāryavāda*.

Sometimes the Personal Creator is said to have desired a consort or wife (jāyā) in the beginning of creation and thus can be compared to human experience.[1] In *Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad*, this analogy is further detailed. Thus tired of lonliness He divided himself into two — husband and wife, horse and mule, ox and cow....the maleant and the sheant.[2] In this instance the composite working of the process of creation is boldly explained as male and female—both of them opposite types and the fact that there cannot be a creation or generation (as we see in the above cases) without two is expressly recognised. The male and the female elements can be compared to the plus and minus currents together producing electricity.

The male principle can be compared to the seed of active desire, or a conscious energy possessing it and the female to the ground having the latent capacity to generate or expand, or unconscious energy – both being forms or creations of the one source of Conscious Cosmic Energy which has to assume the twin forms in order to give expression to all its Own Being, in the present context the manifest universe.

Lastly, it is remarkable that this theory too, like all other important and advanced theories of creation in the Upaniṣads recognises the hand of a Conscious Energy in the phenomenon of creation of the entire universe.

चानिलयनं च । विज्ञानं चाविज्ञानं च । सत्यं चानृतं च सत्यमभवत् । यदिदं किञ्च । तत्सत्यमित्याचक्षते । *Taittirīyopaniṣad* 2.6.

[1] आत्मैवेदमग्र आसीदेक एव सोऽकामयत जाया मे स्यादथ प्रजायेयाथ वित्तं मे स्यादथ कर्म कुर्वीयेत्येतावान्वै कामो नेच्छंश्चनातो भूयोऽविदत्तस्मादप्येतर्ह्येकाकी कामयते जाया मे स्यादथ प्रजायेयाथ वित्तं मे स्यादथ प्रजायेयाथ वित्तं मे स्यादथ कर्म कुर्वीयेति स यावदप्येतेषामेकैकं न प्राप्नोत्यकृत्स्न एव तावन्मन्यते । *Bṛhadāraṇyakopaniṣad* 1.4.17.

[2] Ibid, 1.4.2-4,

XV. The Concept of Time

Kāla or time as the first cause of the universe, first occurs in the *Atharvaveda* itself[1] where it is stated to be the tremendous force behind creation. The *Maitrī Upaniṣad*[2] supports this theory :

> *From Time flow forth created things.*
> *From Time too, they advance to growth.*
> *In Time too, they do disappear.*
> *Time is a form and formless too.*
> *'tis Time that cooks created things,*
> *All things, indeed, in the Great Soul.*
> *In what, however, Time is cooked....*
> *Who knows that, he the Veda Knows* !

In the *Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad* the Creator[3] *Īśāna Rudra*[4] is extolled as the *yoni*[5] or sole cause[6] of beings, as sarvajña (all-knowing) and beyond Kāla or the trinity of time[7], the eternal cover of all this[8], the own self of everything,[9] or anna[10] (i.e. the elements) and all attributes.[11] He is also the efficient cause of the intermediate stage between creation and creator, or the first manifestation (*saṁyoganimittahetu*).[1] As the indweller of beings[2] He even absolves them at the end of time (antakāla)[3] having created them first. *Ādisaṁyoga* here stands as the meeting point whence creation originates or the one lord Controller (*Rudra*) starts creating and making the seed of many as diverse objects.[4] This creation or the rise of many from one source is in vain termed as chance or natural as well as the time factor (kāla), because the cycle of creation (*brahmacakra*)---is run by the mahiman or great power of the Lord.[5] Though this brahmacakra apparently implies[6] the coming into being, remaining into existence, or fading into the past or getting dissolved of the created objects, and, thus, affords a fair comparision with the mystical Time or Chance driving the cycle of utpatti, sthiti, and laya, the Creator Lord is beyond that cakra or cycle of Brahman or Reality as conceived in the limits of time (and also space). We may, thus, understand that before creation exists Energy or Creator unmoving and at the start of creation the wheel of time as it were is set into motion by the Creator Himself.

---

[1] *Atharvaveda* 19.54; Cf. also *Bhāgavata* 2.6.41-42.

[2] *Maitrī Upaniṣad* 6.14.

[3] स विश्वकृद्विश्वविदात्मयोनिर्ज्ञः कालकालो गुणो सर्वविद्यः । *Śvetāśvataropaniṣad* 6.16.

[4] एको हि रुद्रो न द्वितीयाय तस्थुः य इमांल्लोकान् ईशते ईशनीभिः । प्रत्यङ्जनास्तिष्ठति सञ्चुकोपान्तकाले संसृज्य विश्वा भुवनानि गोपाः, *Śvetāśvataropaniṣad* 3.2.

[5] यच्च स्वभावं पचति विश्वयोनिः Ibid, 5.5.

[6] स कारणं करणधियाधिपो न चास्य कश्चिज्जनिता न चाधिपः Ibid, 6.9.

[7] येनावृतं नित्यमिदं हि सर्वम् । Ibid, 6.2.

[8] कालकालः Ibid, 6.2; आदि : परस्त्रिकालादकलोऽपि दृष्टः । Ibid, 6.5; कालं तथाऽन्ये परिमुह्यमानाः । Ibid, 6.1.

[9] See f. n. 5 above; स्वभावमेके कवयो वदन्ति कालं तथान्ये परिमुह्यमानाः । देवस्यैव महिमा तु लोके येनेदं भ्राम्येत ब्रह्मचक्रम् । Ibid 6.1.

[10] अहमन्नमन्नमदन्तमद्मि । *Taittirīyopaniṣad* 3 10.6.

[11] *Śvetāśvataropaniṣad* 6.1.

Kāla or time has been described as the very essence or at any cost as an attribute of the Creator Lord in all *Paurāṇika*[7] mythologies concerning creation. This proves the uniqueness and potential universality of the time factor in relation to the problem of creation.

The doctrine of the destruction or dissolution into and then the creation afresh of the universe from, the same source, i.e., the creator or supreme Brahman is found at several places thoughout Vedic

---

1. आदिः स संयोगनिमित्तहेतुः । *Śvetāśvataropaniṣad* 6.1.
2. कर्माध्यक्षः सर्वभूताधिवासः । Ibid; Cf. *Bhagawadgītā* 6.31; ibid, 10.20.
3. *Śvetāśvataropaniṣad* 3.2.
4. एको वशी निष्क्रियाणां बहूनामेकं बीजं बहुधा यः करोति । Ibid, 6.12.
5. स्वभावमेके कवयो etc. (see f. n. 9 on page 61).
6. तेनेशितं कर्म विवर्तते ह पृथ्व्यप्तेजोऽनिलखानि चिन्त्यम् । Ibid, 6.2.
7. Cf. *Viṣṇupurāṇa* 1.2.14-15; also Cf. *Bhagawadgītā* 11.32.

literature including the latest Upaniṣads.[1] The *Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad* again significantly puts forth the doctrine of the periodical dissolution and recreation of the universe by the Lord.[2] The reason for such cyclic recreation in terms of time (cf. the concept of beginning and end of the beings or things in the universe in a regular way) is stated thus :

> *That which he created he then takes again, Becoming one with the being of being :*
> *In order then........*
> *To begin afresh the work rich in gunas,*
> *Apportioning to each their attributes.*[3]

That it is only the soul's actions which prompt the creator to "apportion to each their attributes" *Sarvān bhāvān viniyojayet* - is immediately asserted next :

> *Where they are not there action comes to nought, Thither he departs, actionless, in reality another.*

where the bhāvas which constitute the empirical nature are destroyed by knowledge in the case of a soul and actions come to a nought and a recreation no longer takes place.

XVI. Couclusion

Thus, we may conclude that in the period of the Upaniṣads several new and developed solutions were speculated on the problem of creation, although many of them are discernable in seeds even as early as in the Saṁhitā literature. Further, it will become positively obvious through comparision that several of these concepts were fruitfully transmitted by the Upaniṣads and adopted by the much later

---

1. Cf. *Ṛgveda* 10.190.3; *Vājasaneyisaṁhitā* 32.8; *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa* 11.3.3.1; ibid, 13.7.1.1; *Bṛhadāraṇyakopaniṣad* 1.2.1; ibid, 1.5.3; *Māṇḍūkyopaniṣad* 1.6; *Muṇḍakopaniṣad* 1.1.7; *Cūlikopaniṣad* 17-18.
2. *Śvetāśvataropaniṣad* 3.2; Cf also सूर्यचन्द्रमसो धाता यथापूर्वमकल्पयत् *Ṛgveda* 10.190 3.
3. *Śvetāśvataropaniṣad* 6.3.4.

systems of Vedānta and Sāṅkhya etc. in the history of Indian Philosophy. Flashes of divine intuitive realization enabled the 'seers' of the Vedic age right from the period of the Saṁhitās to the very Upaniṣadic times, not only to retain uniform and transmit intact the universal truth about the 'creation' phenomenon but also to reveal it inspiredly in highly suggestive, symbolic and scientific language. Indeed, the whole orthodox tradition of philosophical thinking in India has preserved and revered the high wisdom and reliability of the Veda which is often described as divine or as the very embodiment of all knowledge, and no wonder, the concepts advanced for the solution of the problem of creation as revealed in the last phase of the Vedic thinking, i.e., the Upaniṣads have ensured an honourable as well as lasting place for themselves in the philosophical treasure of mankind.

4

THE NYĀYAVAIŚEṢIKA

I.. *General Background*

It is well-known that a powerful attack[1] on the hitherto unquestioned theistic ideals and dogmas by the nāstika (heretical) Bauddhas, Jainas and Lokāyatas led the traditional orthodox scholars to systematize, rearrange and safeguard the truth and greater authority of the Veda, Smṛti et cetera on the one hand and of the concepts of God, Souls, Elements, Knowledge etc. as prevailing in society till then, on the other. Reasoning henceforth took the place of faith and intuition in the domain of philosophical enquiry; the authority of the scripture or the evidence of the senses was subjected to a critical and objective test, as the etymology of the term *ānvīkṣikī*[2] suggests. This (ānvīkṣikī) was called Nyāya and the system aimed at championing the authenticity and unassailability of the beliefs and concepts of the traditional as well as of the commonsense views prevalent in society through the ages. Thus, Vācaspati defines the purpose of Nyāyaśāstra to be a critical examination of objects by means of specific well-founded cannons of logical proof. This very approach is found in the minute and almost complete analysis and categorization of the physical aspects of the universe in the Vaiśeṣika, a complementary (like-minded or sister) system.

---

[1] *History of Indian Philosophy* by Mahāmahopādhyāya Dr U. Mishra, Vol. I, pp. 499-501.

[2] *Nyāyabhāṣya* 1.1.1.

II. The Nyāya and the Vaiśeṣika form one School

Nyāya and Vaiśeṣika[1] are called different systems only due to the greater emphasis that the Nyāya lays on the necessary means of right cognition (pramāṇa), argumentation (anumāna) and discussion (vāda) and the Vaiśeṣika on a comprehensive analysis of all the categories of subtle and gross existences in the universe (which, again, are taken for granted under the lone head of the knowable or "*prameya*" in the Nyāya). But the fundamental similarity of commonsense approach[2] to the nature of the conscious as well as inert forms of matter characterizes the close affinity between these two allied systems. This is why various well-known votaries of these two originally different systems later on came to recognise the utility and compatibility of one for the other in their expositions. Thus, the Nyāyavaiśeṣika school is commonly and correctly recognised as integrally forming one school of Indian Philosophy.

III. The Uncreated Substances of the Universe

The Nyāyavaiśeṣika believes that the objective world and its multifarious experiences are concerned with both the eternal as well

---

1. *Conception of Matter according to Nyāyavaiśeṣika* by Dr. U. Mishra, pp. 37-50.
2. "The joint system....deals with all the forms of gross matter in the most natural way so as to satisfy the commonsense of man and be in agreement with the actual reality and the conventions of the external world (vyavahāra and pratīti). But at the same time it talks of parmaṇus and dvyaṇukas also which shows that the system deals with even those forms of matter which are beyond the scope of commonsense view." Ibid, p. 52.

as the non-eternal substances.[1] The former group consists of the five atomic elements viz., earth (pṛthivī), water (āpas), air (vāyu), fire or heat (tejas) and the internal organ or mind (manas) as well as the four ubiquitous ones viz., ether (ākāśa), time (kāla), space (dik) and the soul (ātman). These nine eternal[2] substances are the foundation or the ultimate cause of all products or aggregate effects (in other words all creation) in the universe and are not effects or created objects as such.

IV. The Non-Eternal Substances And The Atomic Theory Involved in Their Production

The gross objects or products of the world of common experience (e.g., the jar, the tree et cetera) are infinitesimal and, hence, capable of movements, and are distinguished by the difference in their component substances having different attributes et cetera. These are divisible ultimately to the atoms.

We can now examine how an ordinary lump of earth, for example, can be said to be created from atoms (paramāṇus) which are both collectively and individually imperceptible[3] and hence cannot produce anything by themselves, otherwise, a chain of production one after the other would make them (i.e. the atoms) appear as non-eternal and as having parts like the composite (*avayavin*) and, therefore, finite (*mūrta*) lump of earth (*mṛtpiṇḍa*) et cetera. But they are the ultimate material causes (and, hence, indivisible any further[4]) of the various perceptible

---

1. These, however, form only one of the seven categories of reality or predicable existence as propounded in this school.
2. Eternal means existing and uncaused. Cf. *Vaiśeṣikasūtra* 4.1.1.
3. *Conception of Matter* by Dr. U. Mishra, f. n. 14 on p. 66. But they are perceptible to yogins Cf. *Vaiśeṣika Upaskāra* 8.1.2.
4. This is based on the experience that all gross products or substances are composed of several smaller parts. *Nyāyavārttika* 4.1.21.; These atoms are declared to be without extension in space, or else, being composite they could

products. *Adṛṣṭa* and Divine Will (which we shall discuss later on) as instrumental or remote causal factors produce motion in individual paramāṇus which then cluster together in twos and form the *dvyaṇukas*. The two paramāṇus of earth et cetera are material causes of earthly dvyaṇukas et cetera respectively while their combination (*saṁyoga*) acts as the nonmaterial cause. When three dvyaṇukas being moved (as in the case of the paramāṇus earlier), again, combine together they produce the *trasareṇus* of the class of earth etc. Four trasareṇus likewise, produce *caturaṇukas* and so on and so forth till the final product (*anty-āvayavin*), in the present case the lump of earth, comes to exist or is created. By the way we can note how the same lump of earth is changed into a jar by the moving wheel, stick, and the pot-maker who act as instrumental causes.

This proeess of atomic creation or production is common to all the physical products whether earthly (pārthiva), airy (vāyavīya), firy (āgneya) or watery (jalīya).[1]

This explains the creative process or causal operation in the case of the non-eternal substances, which are generally classified as (1) finite organisms[2] (*bhogāyatana* or śarīra), (2) the sense-organs[3] (indriyas) (both of these are necessary for psychic productions like pleasure, pain,

---

not be permanent. No Naiyāyika has yet tried to show how two objects devoid of extension can combine. This weakness of the school is fully exploited by Śaṁkarācārya in his refutation of the atomic theory in *Śāṁkara Bhāṣya* 2.2.12-17.

[1] Ākāśa has no parts or paramāṇus and hence is never produced or caused.

[2] All products or non-eternal objects exist within the limitations of time and space and the ātman is all pervading, hence, the need for the latter to assume the limitation (or *upādhi*) of the physical organism where alone consciousness, desire, pleasure etc. can be produced through the ātman-manas combination.

[3] These are created out of the five '*bhūtas*' or elements respectively. Cf. *Nyāyasūtra* 1.1.12 and *Bhāṣya* on it.

desire, effort in the ātman), and (3) the gross objects like the jar, the tree et cetera---known as viṣayas or objects of perception.

V. Motion[1] *and Its Role in Creation (Both Physical and Psychic)*

Although motion is not independent like substance in which it must inhere before it comes to exist, the production of the various objects of the universe like the tree, jar et cetera from the four types of atoms as mentioned above in the physical sphere as well as that of the products like knowledge effort, pleasure etc. in the psychic sphere are possible respectively, in the former case, by the bringing about of conjunction between paramāṇus caused by motion, and in the latter case, by the presence of motion in the minds, causing their conjunction with the souls.[2]

In other words, no creation or production of the everyday-being-witnessed and continuously changing objects and experiences is possible without motion, the eternal being indivisible, distinct and unmoved by themselves. That even in the beginningless cyclic universal creation and dissolution motion of corresponding high magnitude must be involved is self-evident.

---

1. Motion is caused in the substances having limited form (i. e. the मूर्तद्रव्यs) (Cf. *Praśastapādabhāṣya* with *sūkti*, *setu* and *vyomavatī* p. 290; *Vaiśeṣika Upaskāra* 2.1.21) by weight (Cf. *Vaiśeṣikasūtra* 1.1.29), effort (Cf. ibid), conjunction (Cf. ibid) either due to forcible contact (Cf. ibid 5.1.3) or by impulsion (Cf. ibid 5.1.10), fluidity (Cf *Praśastapādabhāṣya* p. 290), unseen force (Cf. *Vaiśeṣikasūtra* 5 1.15. For example, the motion of the needle towards the magnet is attributed to adṛṣṭa), and impression (Cf *Praśastapādabhāṣya* pp. 633-34).
2. *Nyāyasūtra* and *Bhāṣya* 1.1.16; ibid, 1.1.4; *Conception of Matter* by Dr. U. Mishra p. 196; *Vaiśeṣika Sūtra* 5.2.23.

VI. The Non-Eternal Qualities of the Earthly Objects and the Process of Chemical Action Involved in Their Production.

The airy atoms possess touch, the firy atoms possess also colour and the watery atoms possess taste as well besides colour and touch. These qualities are all eternal and are not produced due to chemical action as such.[1] But the earthly atoms possess qualities of colour, taste, smell and touch which are all non-eternal[2], for, these are produced or manifested and remain changing due to the application of heat through the process of chemical action (*pākaja-prakriyā*).[3]

Chemical action (*pāka*) is a kind of conjunction of the firy or *taijasa* elements (atoms) with the earthly atoms by which the previous colour, taste, smell and touch are destroyed and new colour etc. are produced in their place. For example, a green mango fruit (an earthly object) assumes another yellow colour due to the taijasa conjunction. Although[4], every quality at every stage of the earthly object is produced by the process of chemical action, yet, the above example takes into account only one particular stage. It is, thus, well-known how green bananas or mangoes get ripened by a strong application of heat and come to possess entirely new and welcome colour, taste, smell and touch required for ready meals to guests in a matter of hours, and not weeks which is ordinarily the case. The human body, the tree, the milk etc. keep on changing in respect of these qualities due to the chemical action.

Firy atoms (taijasa paramāṇus) produce motion in the ultimate constituents of an earthly object through their forcible contact[5] (*abhi-*

---

[1] See *Conception of Matter* by Dr. U. Mishra, f. n.s. 44-48 on pp. 74-75.

[2] See Ibid, f. n. 40 on page 74.

[3] See Ibid, f. n. 41.

[4] See Ibid, f n. 54 on p. 77.

[5] Cf. Ibid, f. n. 52.

ghāta) or impulsion[1] (*nodana*). This motion produces disjunctions which step by step destroy the conjunctions existing between the different constituents (or avayavas—from the kapālas or halves onwards of the raw jar being treated with heat, for example) of the composite and finally reduces them to their ultimate particles (i.e. the material causes- the atoms). Next, the former qualities of the earthly object are destroyed by a fresh fire contact (taijasa saṁyoga). Consequently, there is yet another fresh similar contact of taijasa which finally produces new qualities or attributes in place of the old ones. These qualities are thus rightly called as 'heat-born' or *pākaja*. The earthen jar, in this way, when subjected to heat effect by the pot-maker assumes the red colour in the place of the former yellowish or blackish white colour.

This process of chemical action has been variously described to take from eleven to six moments[2] as a time-limit according to different scholars but the basic process remains unaltered.[3] For example, the acceptance or disbelief in *vibhāgajavibhāga* (the fact of one disjunction causing another) obliges the former to propound the time limit of eleven moments and the latter to apportion nine moments (or time-units) only as necessary for the process of chemical action.

That chemical action takes place in earthly substances or objects was agreed to by both the Naiyāyikas and the Vaiśeṣikas, but they differ in the details of it. Thus, the Vaiśeṣikas believe that it takes place in the paramāṇus[4] as it is only then that the final product can have the same attributes that actually belong to its ultimate inherent material causes.[5] But the Naiyāyikas believe that the taijasa contact takes place in the very composite.[6]

---

[1] Cf. *Conception of Matter* by Dr. U. Mishra, p. 77, f. n. 53.

[2] Cf. Ibid, f. n. 71 p. 84.

[3] For these different views see pp. 84-92 of Ibid.

[4] Cf. the designation of पीलुपाकवादिन् for them.

[5] Cf. The concept of 'Kāraṇaguṇāḥ Kāryaguṇān Samārabhante.' in *Tarkabhāṣā*, p. 181.

[6] Cf. the designation of पिठरपाकवादिन् for them.

The importance and acceptance of the Vaiśeṣika *pīlupāka* as the standard Nyāyavaiśeṣika viewpoint are to prove that the attributes like consciousness, pleasure etc. cannot inhere in earth and other bhūtas, because, the above-mentioned attributes (or qualities) do not eternally pervade the whole substance (i. e. are not *yāvaddravyabhāvins*, for, these are not produced in the eternal and ubiquitous souls beyond the limitations of time and space), whereas, the attributes of the earthly composites (or non-eternal products) inhere in them only as long as they themselves exist. Again, the fact that the attributes of an earthly object inhere in all the constituents – right upto the ultimate ones — can be demonstrated only when we reduce them to its paramāṇus.[1]

VII. The Non-Being and Creation

Non-being has also been accepted as a separate category of reality which is experienced and can be explained from the viewpoint of the Nyāyavaiśeṣika. Of the various non-beings (abhāvas) only prāgabhāva and pradhvaṁsābhāva, antecedents and consequents (or resultants) to every creation or production (which is invariably transient or non-eternal) and to every dissolution or extinction respectively, are relevant to our understanding of the theory of creation as propounded by the Nyāyavaiśeṣika school.

VIII. Creation And the Nyāyavaiśeṣika Concept of Causality or Ārambha

All objects and phenomena in the physical or psychic universe are governed by the theory of causation. In other words, all that appears new or has come to exist must be an effect of some prior causal factors. Nothing in the world of common experience can reasonably be explained to have come into being or to have been created or produced unless we accept the fact that there were some antecedent factors or causes for the products or aggregate effects. The different objects of experience have thus their beginning or creation (*ārambha*) in the background of their causes.

---

[1] See ***Conception of Matter*** by Dr. U. Mishra, f. n. 85 on p. 92.

Thus the concept of causality is of central importance in the theory of creation as advanced in the Nyāyavaiśeṣika.

The Nyāyavaiśeṣika believes in the eternal atoms of fire, earth, water and air as the ultimate material causes of all physical objects in the universe. These atoms of which all effects or things (kāryas) are composed of do not change. In this respect the atoms are comparable to the *pradhāna* of Sāṅkhya. But, then, according to it the effect or product is something new being formerly (i.e., prior to the causal operation or creation) non-existent (asat) and in this respect its concept of cause and effect can be compared to the doctrine of momentary change (kṣaṇabhaṅgavāda) of the Buddhists. Because kārya is described as asat in the Nyāyavaiśeṣika their concept of causality is often known as asatkāryavāda.

Thus, the Nyāyavaiśeṣika believes in the permanence and eternity of the material cause of creation the ultimate atoms remaining the same before, during and after the causal operation or the process of the origination of the effect. But a new effect can come to exist according to this concept only after the evanescence of the proximate material cause.[1] Curds, for example, are produced only after the destruction of the milk by a rearrangement of the component atoms.[2]

Then, the new effect has an absolute difference (atyantabheda)[3] as compared to its material cause. The new composite effect, for

---

1. *Nyāyasūtra* 4.1.14.
2. *Nyāya Sūtra* 3.2.16, *Nyāya Bhāṣya* 4.1.18.
3. Of course, this is reasonably qualified by the adjective '*abhedasahiṣṇu*', for the effect *paṭa* cannot but invariably be produced from its material or inherent causes the *tantus* only without whose existence its own existence cannot be sustained. Cf. the concept of *ayutasiddha* referred to on p. 75.

example, a piece of cloth is altogether different[1] from its proximate material causes, the threads. Thus, the whole cloth is different from its component parts viz., the threads, the wholesome variegated colour (*citravarṇa*) is quite different from the various colours that compose it.[2] Hence, according to this concept of causality material cause alone is inadequate to explain completely the emergence or production of the new effect.

The Nyāyavaiśeṣika, therefore, also postulates non-material and efficient or operative causes to fully account for the knowledge and usage of distinction (bhedapratīti and bhedavyavahāra) between the material or primary cause and the effect. Strikingly enough Sāṅkhya fails to establish any difference between cause and effect, which is at the root of the concept of causality according to the commonsense point of view.

The cause (kāraṇa) has been technically defined as that which invariably and necessarily precedes the effect (cf. *kāryaniyatapūrvavṛttitva*) excluding all that do not directly contribute to the resultant effect (cf. *ananyathāsiddhatva*). For example, the lump of clay, the moving wheel, the stick, the pot-maker, the conjunction of the halves (*kapālas*) et cetera that invariably and necessarily precede the production of the effect (viz., the *ghaṭa*) are its causes. But the donkey on which incidentally the clay was brought to the place of the pot-maker is *anyathāsiddha* as the same act could have been performed by the means of a bullock-cart, a coolie etc. as well.

The causes of an effect have been divided into three types in the Nyāyavaiśeṣika. The inherent cause (*samavāyi kāraṇa*) is that in which the effect comes to exist and is produced by the relationship of inherence (*samavāya*).

---

1. *Nyāya Sūtra* 2.1.30.
2. *Nyāya Vārttika* 2.1.36-37 and *Tātparyaṭīkā* on Ibid.

By the way, it may not be out of place to note that samavāya is a special relationship that exists between the part and the whole (*avayavāvayavī*), between the generality and the individual (*jātivyaktī*), between action and the actor or the moved (*kriyākriyāvantau*), between an attribute or quality and the qualified or the possessor of the attribute (*guṇaguṇinau*), and between particularity and the eternal substances. The 'part' et cetera respectively are invariably dependent for their existence on the 'whole' et cetera respectively at all times except when the latter get destroyed and the two (i.e. the 'part' etc. and the 'whole' etc.) in each case are called *ayutasiddha* as such. Thus, for example, according to the Nyāyavaiśeṣika, a piece of cloth comes to exist in the threads which are its inherent cause and substratum. The lump of clay (*mṛtpiṇḍa*), in this way, is the inherent cause of the jar (ghaṭa).

The second type of kāraṇa is the non-inherent cause (*asamavāyi kāraṇa*) which together with the effect inheres in either the inherent cause or the inherent cause of that 'inherent cause.' Thus, 'the conjunction of threads', inhering in the threads (i.e., the inherent cause of cloth) together with the cloth, is the non-inherent cause of the effect 'cloth'. Similarly, 'the colour of the threads' can also be explained as the non-inherent cause of 'the colour of the cloth', the inherent cause of the inherent cause are the threads in which the colour of the threads together with that of the cloth exist by the relationship of inherence.

The remaining causes which fulill the general conditions of being a cause as discussed earlier and do not come under the above two types of causes, are all termed as efficient cause (*nimitta kāraṇa*). The weaver and the pot-maker are the efficient causes of the effects viz., the piece of cloth and the jar respectively.

IX. Universal Dissolution and Creation and the Roles of God and the Law of Karman or Unseen Force Therein

According to the Nyāyavaiśeṣika view the world of objects and experiences as the souls (jīvas or ātmans) have been knowing, is beginningless, although there is a continuous cycle of creation and dissolution (sṛṣṭi and pralaya) following each other in succession after a fixed duration. By the way, it may be stated that this theory, interestingly enough, is peculiarly supported by the beliefs of the common man and has been exuberantly developed in the purāṇa and smṛti literature and draws great traditional sanctity from its Vedic origin.

(*A*) *Īśvara*

Also, however, it was reasonably argued by the Nyāyavaiśeṣika theorists that universal creation and dissolution on such a big scale cannot be explained or accounted for by the operation of the accumulated *adṛṣṭa* of the jīvas and the inert atoms which are imparted motion by it for different products, alone. Therefore, the acceptance of Īśvara (God), an active and conscious agent, Who is supposed to have independent knowledge and will and Who is free from the necessity of assuming an organism and sense organs (including the mind) of His own —became imperative. The jīvātman possesses demerit, nescience, and carelessness[1]; remains in bondage and gets liberated. But, the Īśvara is free from all this. On the contrary, He possesses the eight-fold aiśvaryas (*aṇiman* et cetera). In fact, the infinite number of souls depend for their knowledge, desire, effort et cetera on the limitations of *prārabdha* or adṛṣṭa, time, space, and the external sense-organs, the particular minds and the external objects or created products (viṣayas).

In other words, Īśvara, as described above, helps us explain the facts of pre-phenomenal stage when the entire familiar created universe—so very vast and varied as well as full of the changing certainties and complexes—is yet to come into being. The created universe, as it were, is a vast mechanical product—wherein the eternal nine substances are the material causes, motion et cetera imparted into them are the non-material causes and the creator God is the great conscious agent presiding over the just and smooth periodic phenomenon of universal creation and dissolution as its efficient cause. This type of image is familiar to the common-sense viowpoint, when we find the building of a huge bridge, house or even a small earthen pot in the process of actual production.

---

[1] *Nyāyabhāṣya* 4.1.21.

(*B*) *Adṛṣṭa*

But Īśvara is not a blind force and the sole efficient cause of the cyclic creation and dissolution of the universe according to the Nyāyavaiśeṣika school. The law of karman (often referred to as divine justice or daivī cakra) or the unseen force which the orthodox Indians have traditionally upheld as supreme in all walks of life and in all corners of the universe—is accepted by the Nyāyavaiśeṣika also. Accordingly the mental impression (*bhāvanā*) of all activities cause merit and demerit (*dharma* and *adharma*[1]) both of which inhere in the mind which accompanies each soul even at the time of death. This unseen force (*adṛṣṭa* or *prārabdha*) expedites or causes the individual soul to experience suitable retribution in the shape of pleasure or pain (sukha and duḥkha). It also motivates or determines the time, place and the organism et cetera as suited to them in each case. Thus the ripe time, places, modes and forms of creation, in all its details, after the period of dissolution are determined or guided by the adṛṣṭa alone and the Īśvara not only takes cognizance of it but fully respects it at the time of each creation. We may even compare Īśvara with the driver of an express train and the adṛṣṭa with the railway track along which alone the journey of universal creation and dissolution, comparable to its running and stoppage at necessary and regular intervals, takes place. These individual adṛṣṭas of the souls may, therefore, be understood by us as active principles governing and guiding the movement of the atoms, the ultimate material causes of the universal creation.

---

[1] Adṛṣṭa or unseen force in Vaiśeṣika is the same as the dharma and adharma (merit and demerit) of Nyāya.

(*C*) *Pralaya*

It is held on the lines of the Vedic *dhātā yathāpūrvamakalpayat*[1] that after the end of 100 years of Brahmā (whose one day or *ahorātra* is equal to one year of human beings) the time is ripe for His relief or respite. Then, God or *Maheśvara* (i. e. Lord of the whole universe) has a desire in his mind to destroy all the products including those in the form of ceaseless and tiresome rebirths (i.e. the creation and dissolution of bodies after and before death) for the living beings (i.e. the souls or jīvas). This need for rest for the souls has been likened to the popular reflection of a man tired with work and experience (viz., that of the psychic products like effort, desire, pleasure and pain etc.) during the long day needing a full night's rest subsequently.

This desire of the Maheśvara prevents or causes to come to a standstill the normal functioning or the modes (*vṛttis*) of the adṛṣṭas of the jīvas which, during the creation period, cause the production and existence of organisms, sense-organs, physical substances and the psychic experiences.

Consequently, motions are produced from the conjunctions belonging to the ātmans and the paramāṇus helped by the Divine Will, which in turn produce disjunctions between the ultimate atoms leading to the destruction of the previous conjunctions existing between them, which had helped in the production of the composite effects like the suitable organisms etc. during the process of creation.

In this way, every product including the invisible dvyaṇukas and the gross elements (*mahābhūtas*) is destroyed and only the ultimate atoms and the other eternal substances including the numerous ātmans together with merit and demerit (i. e. adṛṣṭa) exist. Even the heat-born attributes of colour and the rest exist in the form of limitations (*upādhis*) of Kāla or time. The motions produced by the velocity

---

[1] See pp. 27-31.

(vega) generated by the destruction of diverse physical products as well as prior non-being (prāgabhāva) of future creations exist during this period of dissolution for 100 Brāhma (i. e. the creator's) years.

All this, however, is about *avāntara* pralaya or *Khaṇḍa* pralaya, in which, only the non-eternal products (anityakāryas) are destroyed. There is also mentioned by some scholars a mahāpralaya or total dissolution in which all substances or positive products are fully destroyed and after this there is no creation.[1] But, largely perhaps owing to its different and inconvenient apprehension by the common man, this mahāpralaya is not the immediate or even distinctive concern of the general theory of creation and dissolution as propounded in the Nyāyavaiśeṣika school. We may, therefore, conclude that the cycle of universal creation and dissolution, too, is both beginningless and endless.

(*D*) *Sṛṣṭi*[2]

After the period of dissolution or cosmic rest the accumulated adṛṣṭa of the souls (jīvas) comes to operate through the Divine Will for the creation of beings and objects suited to their requirements for the purpose of experiencing pleasure and pain as fruits of their past deeds (karmans). Then the conjunctions are produced between the ātmans and the paramāṇus, which, in turn produce motion in the air atoms which, again, join together as dvyaṇuka and so on ending at last in the final (mahān) air (vāyu) which remains vibrating in the space. It possesses continuous strong vibration because of intensive velocity and due to its (i. e. as the first product) having no obstacles in its movement. Later on, a big reservoir of water from the water atoms through the usual process, is produced in the mahān vāyu the latter acting as the former's substratum due to its being an obstacle of weight on account of the velocity and touch that it possesses. The waters remain flowing through the air's velocity. After this, in the like manner is produced the big earth in a solid form from its paramāṇus. In those very waters (i.e. in the jalarāśi) a big heap of tejas out of fire atoms is produced.

---

[1] Cf. *Conception of Matter* by Dr. U. Mishra, f. n. 5 on p. 263.

[2] *Praśastapādabhāṣya* (Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series, No. 316 with *Sūkti*; *Setu* and *Vyomavatī*) pp. 277-308.

After the four mahābhūtas have been created one after the other the same Divine Will (i.e. the Saṁkalpa of *Maheśvara*) causes a cosmic egg (brahmāṇḍa) to be produced out of the fire and earth atoms, in which the legendary caturmukha Brahmā or the 'great grandfather' of the entire creation is produced together with all the lokas (regions). This Brahmā is engaged in the full-fledged production of living beings by the Divine Will. He has extraordinary powers, intellect, dispassion, knowledge of the time of the fructification of the beings' past karmans and creates from his mind Prajāpatis, Manus, several groups of gods, ṛṣis and *pitṛs*. These are called ayonija, being mental products only. Next are born the four castes and other beings of low grade from his mouth, arms, thighs and feet. The beings or jīvas are connected with adequate (i.e. the deserved) degree of dharma (righteousness), jñāna (knowledge), vairāgya (detachment) and aiśvarya (extraordinary powers) on the one hand and that of adharma, ajñāna, avairāgya and anaiśvarya together with their inescapable results viz., pleasure, pain, mental impression, desire, effort et cetera on the other.

X. The Aim of Creation

After all that we have known and critically discussed about the theory of creation in this chapter there arises a natural desire to know why should there be any creation at all ? The cause or purpose is stated thus by the traditional Nyāyavaiśeṣikas. Living beings are always thinking, desiring and doing deeds.[1] The impressions of these remain in some form and remain unseen (hence, called adṛṣṭa) till the time of their fructification. We may compare this phenomenon with the reaping of the harvest produced out of the seeds at a suitable time.

---

[1] Cf. *Bhagavadgītā* 3.5.

The concept of cause and effect as discussed earlier as well as the concept of divine or poetic justice for misdeeds and good deeds—which form the basis of morality and the code of ordinary human conduct, and, the need to accept individual living beings as themselves responsible for all the pleasure and pain experiences during their present life-time and afterwards—together present an unescapable picture before the commonsense viewpoint of the society in general and that of the Nyāyavāiśeṣika in particular, so that they come to have full belief in all the implications of the theory of Karman as detailed above.

Hence, the aim of all creation is to make possible the due experience (or bhoga) of pleasure and pain in accordance with the souls' individual past thoughts, desires and deeds, and, in this way, the creation of the objects, the organisms et cetera also affords a hope for them eventually to attain to the highest well-being or freedom from pains—which, however, is not the direct aim of creation. But, strictly moral, disciplinarian and equitable treatment for all the living beings, so that, they may make reasonable progress on the path of righteousness leading to happiness is perhaps the most laudable characterstic of the aim of creation according to the Nyāyavaiśeṣika.

XI. Conclusion

We have so far been critically evaluating the various aspects of and factors responsible for, creation in the Nyāyavaiśeṣika school, All said and understood, a few striking general characterstics may carefully be noted by way of conclusion of this study :

(a) Creation according to the Nyāyavaiśeṣika is a continuing process for explaining all change or newness that occurs at any time and place both in the physical as well as the psychic world.

(b) Intellectual soundness and an exhaustively analytical attitude are widely evidenced in the treatment of the complex problem of creation according to the Nyāyavaiseṣika. The high place accorded to reasoning (tarka) and the knowledge of the positive categories of reality by methods of comparision (showing both *sādharmya* and *vaidharmya*) between one and the rest in each case are specially remarkable in this respect.

(c) Conformity to the commonsense point of view with regard to the forms of reality of both gross and minute objects as well as with regard to the usually accepted concepts of jīva, īśvara, adṛṣṭa et cetera, to a large extent, have made the Nyāyavaiśeṣika theory of creation more popular than that of any other orthodox school of Indian Philosophy. This sensitiveness for common beliefs, duly tampered with caution and critical acumen, makes this theory greatly intelligible (as opposed to an abstact one) to most enquirers of truth.

(d) The characterstic of pluralistic realism in the Nyāyavaiśeṣika forms an important background to the total understanding of its theory of creation in a proper perspective. Realism is amply reflected in the school's firm belief in the independent entity of all forms of reality or predicable existence which do not depend either on the cognizing mind or on their cognition itself for their existence. The element of pluralism is borne out by the emphasis laid on particularities; the plurality of the souls deduced on the basis of the difference of birth, activity, knowledge et cetera of so many conscious beings is notable in this respect.

(e) That the world of conscious living beings and inert physical objects is a moral stage for the uplift and intimate governance of the individual souls—has been clearly visualised in the aim of creation as propounded by the Nyāyavaiśeṣika.

(f) Matter and spirit, the latter consisting of souls having limited consciousness and God 'the supreme Lord of the universe', have been properly and significantly distinguished and assigned important roles in the theory of creation according to this school.

5

THE SĀṄKHYAYOGA

I. *General Background*

The viewpoint of the *Sāṅkhyayoga* is mainly intellectual or conceptual based on perceptions or realizations of a highly sophisticated and advanced meditation. It propounds and deals at length with the one ultimate unmanifest principle and then its evolutes from Mahat (intellect) to the *tanmātras* (the elements 'alone', i. e. in subtle from), all of them imperceptible and practically unrealizable for the beginner or common enquirer of the Nyāyavaiśeṣika stage. The gross elements viz., the earth et cetera are referred to at the end and what is more are said as incapable of having or causing any further (i.e. different) effects or principles (tattvāntaras).

Whatever creation or evolution takes place, we can surmise, therefore, is not at the gross physical level whose realities are neither denied nor are the immediate purpose of investigation according to this school, but at the mental and even supra-mental level. The so-called Sāṅkhya school proves these facts theoretically (i.e. through a superficial or hypothetical knowledge) and the so-called Yoga school demonstrates their functions practically and makes realization of the ultimate goal possible (through true knowledge).

Knowledge and its realization go hand in hand with each other and are complementary in all the main schools of orthodox Indian Philosophy. One cannot have true knowledge (i. e. full conviction of and insight into facts things or phenomena) of such objects (as mentioned above) by merely talking and by having indirect assertion through mundane reasonings.

It is simply for this reason that the Sāṅkhya and the Yoga integrally form one school and the path or vision of reality they show to the enquirer is also one.[1]

II. The Prominence of 'Creation' in the Sāṅkhyayoga School

All the twentyfive well-known principles (tattvas) of the universe have been classified mainly into four categories based on their respective causal and productive efficieney viz., (1) that of the creative, (2) that of the creative and the created, (3) that of the created, and (4) that of that which is neither created nor creative. This division explicitly distinguishes the importance that the Sāṅkhyayoga exponents attach to the theory of production or creation as a whole. Thus, it is said that Primordial Matter or Nature, the root cause of all created objects, is not produced; the Great Principle (intellect or Buddhi) and the rest are seven, being both the producer and produced; the sixteen are the produced; and the spirit is neither the producer nor the produced.[2]

---

[1] सांख्ययोगौ पृथग्बालाः प्रवदन्ति न मनीपिणः । एकमप्यास्थितः सम्यगुभयोर्विन्दते फलम् ॥ यत्सांख्यैः प्राप्यते स्थानं तद्योगैरपि गम्यते । एकं सांख्यं च योगं च यः पश्यति स पश्यति ॥ *Bhagavadgītā* 5.4-5.

[2] मूलप्रकृतिरविकृतिर्महदाद्याः प्रकृतिविकृतयः सप्त । पोडशकस्तु विकारो न प्रकृतिर्न विकृतिः पुरुषः ॥ *Sāṅkhyakārikā* 3,

III. The Concept of Causality (Pariṇāma)

Creation or production of the different objects of the universe presupposes the concept of and relation between cause and effect in Indian Philsophy. As such Sāṅkhyayoga believes in effect (pariṇāma) or modification (vikāra). The process and nature of creation in this school, therefore, can be evaluated in the right perspective only after a clear understanding of its concept of causality.

According to this concept, the effect essentially exists in the cause even before the former's evolution or gross appearance. In other words, the effect is an entity even prior to the operation of the cause. Five arguments are adduced for this assertion.[1]

(A) A non-entity can never be brought into existence :

If the effect were a non-entity before the causal operation it could never be brought into existence by anyone, just as even a thousand artists cannot turn the blue colour into that of yellow. Also non-entity (asattā) and entity (sattā) both cannot be supposed as properties of the effect because such an effect (or qualified object) being at first non-existent, no property could come to belong to it, let alone that of entity. Besides, it is unreasonable to accept non-entity belonging to the effect (as a property) when it (i. e. the former) is neither related (sambaddha) nor cognate (tadātmaka) with it. Hence the effect subsists both before and after the causal operation.

The sole function of the cause, therefore, remains to manifest or unfold the pre-existing effect. Such a manifestation of something existing beforehand is a fact of common experience and occurance, as that of the oil from sesamum by pressure, of rice from paddy by thumping and of milk from cows by milking. On the other hand, a non-entity, just as the horns of a hare is never seen to be either manifested or produced.

---

[1] असदकरणादुपादानग्रहणात् सर्वसम्भवाभावात् । शक्तस्य शक्यकरणात् कारणभावाच्च सत्कार्यम् ॥ *Ṣāṅkhyakārikā* 9 and *Ṭattvakaumudī* thereon,

(*B*) *There is a determinate relation between the material cause and the effect* :

The effect subsists and is produced because of the relation holding between itself and its material cause. That is to say, the cause produces the effect when in relation with it (and not otherwise). For example, the jar is produced out of the lump of clay because it was and is related to it. In this context, it becomes evident that no relationship with a non-existing effect is possible. Hence the effect must have an entity prior to its manifestation or production.

(*C*) *Every effect cannot be possible from every cause* :

If it is argued that the effect is produced by the particular cause while unconnected with it, then, every effect would be justified by every cause without restriction. But, such is not the case. The sands, for example, do not produce oil while only the sesamum does. Hence a connected cause alone can produce a connected effect and not an unconnected cause an unconnected effect. *There is no relation of the cause imbued with entity with non-entity; those holding the production of an unconnected effect will land themselves in a regressus ad infinitum.*[1]

(*D*) *A competent cause produces only that effect for which it is competent* :

Even if no relationship between cause and effect is accepted, the opponent (i.e. the asatkāryavādin) may argue that there is a capability or competency (śakti) in the cause (e.g. in milk) to produce the particular effect (say 'curd') and, thus, only a particular effect (and not all sorts of effects as pointed to in (C) above) is produced from the cause. Now, the Sāṅkhyayoga refutes the above objection in the following manner : does this capability belonging to the cause apply to every effect or only to those for which the cause is capable ?

---

[1] Cf. असत्त्वे नास्ति सम्बन्धः कारणैः सत्त्वसङ्गिभिः असम्बद्धस्य चोत्पत्तिमिच्छतो न व्यवस्थितिः ।। Quoted in *Tattvakaumudī* on *Sāṅkhyakārika* 9,

If the former, then the same confusion (see (C) above) arises; if the latter, how does the capability (or causal energy) apply to non-entity ?

On this point the opponent may assert afresh that the causal energy is itself (i. e. naturally) so constituted so as to produce only certain effects and not others.

The Sāṅkhyayoga again asks if this peculiarly constituted energy (śakti) is connected with the particular effect or not. In case the answer is in the affirmative, no relationship being possible with non-entity the effect must be an entity; in the latter case there is the same endless series of causes and effects. Hence, the effect is an entity even before it is produced.

(*E*) *The effect is non-different from the cause* :

The non-difference between cause and effect in general and the threads and the cloth, for example, in particular, has been established by a process of negative inference (*śeṣavat anumāna* or *avītānumāna*) in the following proofs : The cloth (as an effect) and the threads (as the material cause) do not differ in essence. The cloth inheres in the threads that constitute it, while the essentially different objects e.g. the cow and the horse do not inhere in each other. They (as essentially different objects—e. g. the jar and the cloth) are not related as cause and effect. But, between the cloth and the threads, we find the causal relation subsisting. Hence, the cause and effect can never differ from one another in essence. Then, both junction taking place between essentially different objects e.g. that between a table and a book as well as non-contiguity also found between two essentially different objects, e. g. that between the Vindhyas and the Himālayas—are conspicuously non-existent between the cause and the effect (i.e. between the threads and the cloth in this instance).[1]

---

[1] Cf. *Sāṅkhyatattvakaumudī* on *Sāṅkhyakārikā* 9.

According to Vacaspati Miśra[1] an object differing in essence from another always has a weight different from the latter. For example, the degree of the lowering of the balance caused by two 'pala's is more than that caused by a single 'pala'. But the cloth and the threads which constitute it, are equi-weight. Hence, cloth is non-different from the threads.

The ground of *Tattvakaumudī* may, perhaps, be contradicted on the basis of authorities like Yajñavalkya.[2] Again, we may hold that the ground expounded here is insufficient because, two different objects are not necessarily different in weight causing thereby different levels of lowering of a balance. For example, the shopkeeper puts two essentially different objects viz., the 'iron piece' (say that representing 1 Kilogram) and the heap of salt on either sides of the balance and they are found to be equiweight or multi-weight as intended.

The difference between the cloth and the threads, however, may be supported on the following grounds—(1) When the cloth is destroyed or brought into existence we do not realize that the threads are destroyed or are produced and *vice versa*. (2) Different names are assigned to the cause and the effect in daily usage such as when we say that the 'cloth' exists in or is made out of the 'threads'. (3) The cloth is used for covering our body and the threads for the purpose of sewing et cetera, hence they are different.[3]

---

1. Cf. इतश्च पटः तन्तुभ्यो न भिद्यते, गुरुत्वान्तरकार्याग्रहणात् । इह यद्यस्माद्भिन्नं तस्मात् तस्य गुरुत्वान्तरं कार्यं गृह्यते यथैकपलिकस्य स्वस्तिकस्य यो गुरुत्वकार्योऽवनतिविशेषस्तस्माद्द्विपलिकस्य स्वस्तिकस्य गुरुत्वकार्योऽवनतिभेदोऽधिकः । न च तथा तन्तुगुरुत्वकार्यात् पटगुरुत्वकार्यान्तरं दृश्यते । तस्मादभिन्नस्तन्तुभ्यः पट इति *Sāṅkhyatattvakaumudī* on *Sāṅkhyakārikā* 9.
2. Cf. Yājñavalkyasmṛti 2.179 according to which, coarse wool and cotton yarn gain 10 p. c. in weight in weaving, wool and cotton yarn of middling counts gain 5 p. c., and those of the finer counts gain 3 p. c.
3. Cf. *Tattvakaumudī* on *Sāṅkhykārikā* 9 स्वात्मनि क्रियानिरोधबुद्धिव्यपदेशार्थक्रियाव्यवस्थाभेदाश्च नैकान्तिकं भेदं साधयितुमर्हन्ति etc. and *Suṣamā* on ibid.

To these arguments the Sāṅkhyayoga replies that—

(1) Cause and effect being non-different as established earlier, both production (utpāda) and destruction (vināśa) which evidently are two contradictory states or charcterstics (viruddhadharmas)—cannot be assigned in this instance. The appearance and disappearance of the effects (pariṇāmas or kāryas) in the one cause from which they evolve or arise and into which they dissolve may be compared to the limbs (i.e. the hands and the feet) of the tortoise, which, again and again, emerge from and enter into it. These limbs cannot be said to have been either produced or destroyed because they are ever present in the tortoise. In the same way the jar, the crown etc. which are only particular developments of clay, gold et cetera, on emanating from these latter, are said to be produced; and on entering into them (i.e. being changed into clay etc. respectively) they disappear and are, as such, said to be destroyed.

(2) Although the effect is non-different from its cause, yet the assertion of the relationship between them is based on conventionally accepted difference, e.g., when we say "the 'Tilakas' (i.e. the plants so named) are in the 'forest' " the tilakas and the forest comprising of them are in fact essentially non-different.

(3) Also, different purposes can be served by one and the same substance, for example, the same fire burns, consumes as well as emits light. Hence, the lump of clay and the jar, the threads and cloth need not be supposed different for this reason. Thus, the effects (pariṇāmas) are only evolutions or modifications (āvirbhāvas or vilkāras) as opposed to dissolution or naturalisation (i. e. tirobhāva or prakṛtibhava)—of their cause with which they are essentially non-different.[1]

[1] Cf. *Bhagavadgītā* 2.16; वाचारम्भणं विकारो नामधेयं मृत्तिकेत्येव सत्यम् *Chāndogyopaniṣad* 6.1.4.

IV. The Main Kinds of Pariṇāma[1]

This pariṇāma or vikāra has been defined as the emergence or manifestation (āvirbhāva) of another characterstic or form (*dharma*) in the existing object (i. e. the *dharmin*) after the disappearance or vanishing (tirobhāva) of the former dharma.[2] In this way the manifestation or vyaktīkaraṇa of the different forms or characterstics eternally existing in the unmanifest nature (avyakta prakṛti) of an object is known as pariṇāma in the Sāṅkhyayoga school. Pariṇāma can be (1) of the intellect (*mahat* or buddhi), (2) of the gross elements (bhūtas) as well as (3) of the organs (indriyas).

However, pariṇāma has also been divided into the following three types :

(*A*) *Dharmapariṇāma*

The disappearance of the characterstic or mode (i.e. dharma or svābhāvikavṛtti) of great (i. e. worldly or multifarious) activity (*vyutthāna*) and the rise or manifestation of that of suppression or restraint (nirodha) in the intellect (citta or buddhi) is an effect (pariṇāma) pertaining to dharma. The earth (pṛthivī) is a dharmin or prakṛti (i.e. the cause or object possessing the unmanifest dharmas), and the effects (i.e. the pariṇāmas) such as cow, the jar etc. are its characterstics (dharmas). Similarly, the 'seeing' (ālocana) of blue etc. form is a dharmapariṇāma of the organ of eye.

(*B*) *Lakṣaṇapariṇāma*

The being or existence of the above-mentioned dharmas in the forms of (i.e. during) the three times (lakṣaṇas) of past (atīta), present (vartamāna) and future (anāgata) is called lakṣaṇapariṇāma. Thus, the characterstic of great activity or that of suppression or restraint belonging to the intellect can be said to have threefold lakṣaṇapariṇāma i. e. effect corresponding to one of the three divisions of time. The dharmapariṇāmas of the gross elements as well as those of the organs such as have been referred to in (A) above, for example, also likewise have the lakṣaṇapariṇāma in the terms of atīta. vartamāna and anāgata.

---

[1] *Yogasūtra* 3.9-13 and *Yogabhāṣya* thereon.

[2] अथ कोऽयं परिणामः अवस्थितस्य द्रव्यस्य पूर्वधर्मनिवृत्तौ धर्मन्तरोत्पत्तिः परिणाम इति । *Yogabhāṣya* 3.13.

(*C*) *Avasthāpariṇāma*

When the intellect manifests its characterstic of restraint or suppression of all activity the latter is prominent or powerful and the opposite characterstic of great (or manysided) activity remains subdued or weak. This having 'become powerful' and having 'become weak' is the avasthāpariṇāma of the two dharmas (i.e. nirodha and vyvtthāna) respectively. Similarly, the cow in the present form (—this is lakṣaṇapariṇāma of pṛthivī) may be new-born, adolescent, of young or old age—these conditions, whichever may apply in a particular case, are avasthāpariṇāmas. The jar in the present form, likewise, can have the manifestation of condition or avasthāpariṇāma of newness or oldness. The eye may in the present be conditioned by dimness or clarity which again illustrates avasthāpariṇāma.

All these manifestations or modifications qualify the object (dharmin) which does not give up its permanency or essential nature while in any mode, time or condition. For example, the earth is present in the mode of the jar when the latter is conditioned by the future, comes to belong to the present as new and passes into the past time as old. Therefore, we may conclude that pariṇāma practically or commonly is of only one type although it does appear as of three different types.[1]

---

[1] एते धर्मलक्षणाऽवस्थापरिणामा धर्मिस्वरूपमनतिक्रान्ता इत्येक एव परिणामः सर्वानमून् विशेषानभिप्लवते । *Yogabhāṣya* 3.13.

V. The Concept of the Unmanifest (avyakta) and the Nature and Functioning of the Attributes that Constitute It.

From the finite nature of specific objects, from homogeneity, from evolution being due to active (causal) energy, from the separation of cause and effect, and from the undividedness (resolution) of the whole universe the Unmanifest (avyakta) is the cause; it operates through the three attributes (guṇas) by blending and by modification as water, on account of the difference arising from the receptacle of the Attributes as they are variously demonstrated.[1] The effect being only a developed or manifest state of the cause, in which it lies latent before and after its manifestation or gross appearance, all the substances of the known universe must have their unmanifested condition in the causes. Now, if we go on increasing the series[2] from the grossest elements upwards to comparatively minute and causal substances we would be landed in a *regressus ad infinitum.* In order to avoid this we must postulate the existence of a principle which should be both uncaused and the final substrate of the undeveloped state of all other substances. Thus, such a cause, being by its very nature the unmanifested or final one, is rightly termed avyakta or pradhāna.

The ultimate material cause is one which is ever changing or manifesting or evolving as so many effects in creation. The essential characterstics or the attributes also must necessarily be the same in both cause and effect.[3] It is in this context that the myriad objects of the evolved or manifest universe are termed vyakta or manifest, and the ultimate cause, having the same properties or attributes as the manifest or created world, as Principal or Unmanifest (Pradhāna or Avyakta). This creative activity has been assigned to one creative agent viz., the Unmanifest or Principal cause in this school. Regarding its composition it must be observed that like the evolution for manifestation of a tree from its tiny seed the manifest (vyakta) entities in their minute form are essentially present in a final or last cause (mūlaprakṛti). Again the manifest are many and transitory i. e., they appear and disappear, but their cause the Unmanifest is ever present during both evolution (āvirbhāva) and resolution (tirobhāva) of the manifest realities. The pradhāna of Sāṅkhyayoga is rightly termed as *pariṇāminitya* as opposed to *Kuṭasthanitya*, for, its permanence is subject to constant change or evolution (nityapariṇāma).[1]

---

[1] Dr. G. N. Jha's translation of the following : भेदानां परिमाणात्समन्वयाच्छक्तितः प्रवृत्तेश्च । कारणकार्यविभागाद्वैश्वरूप्यस्य ॥ कारणमस्त्यव्यक्तं प्रवर्तते त्रिगुणतः समुदयाच्च । परिणामतः सलिलवत् प्रतिप्रतिगुणाश्रयविशेषात् ॥ *Śāṅkhyakārikā* 15-16 and *Śāṅkhyatattvakaumudī* on it.

[2] We shall discuss the order of evolution in Section X later on.

[3] Cf. the theory of non-difference between the cause and the effect in section III earlier; also Cf. अविवेक्यादे : सिद्धिः त्रैगुण्यात्तद्विपर्ययाभावात् । कारणगुणात्मकत्वात्कार्यस्याव्यक्तमपि सिद्धम् ॥ *Śāṅkhyakārikā* 14.

Before we can understand how the universal evolution proper takes place according to this school it may be interesting to note the points of difference[2] and similarities[3] between the effects of pradhāna on the one hand and the pradhāna itself on the other. The Manifested (i.e. Vyaktas or the effects of Pradhāna) have a cause, are non-eternal i. e. destructible or revolving (returning to the condition of their material cause), not pervading or extending over all evolving

---

1. Cf. the term प्रसवधर्मि in Sāṅkhyakārikā 11 and *Tattvakaumudī* thereon : प्रसवरूपो धर्मों यः सोऽस्यास्ति इति प्रसवधर्मि । प्रसवधर्मेति वक्तव्ये मत्वर्थीयप्रसवधर्मस्य नित्ययोगमाख्यातुम् । सरूपविरूपपरिणामाभ्यां न कदाचिदपि वियुज्यत इत्यर्थः.। cf. 'त्रिगुणतः' and 'समुदयाच्च' in *Śāṅkhyakārikā* 16; प्रतिसर्गावस्थायां सत्त्वं रजस्तमश्च सदृशपरिणामानि भवन्ति । परिणामस्वभावा हि गुणा नापरिणम्य क्षणमप्यवतिष्ठन्ते । तस्मात् सत्त्वं सत्स्वरूपतया तमस्तमोरूपतया प्रतिसर्गावस्थायामपि प्रवर्तते । *Sāṅkhyatattvakaumudī* on *Sāṅkhyakārikā* 16.
2. हेतुमदनित्यमव्यापि सक्रियमनेकमाश्रितं लिङ्गम् । सावयवं परतन्त्रं व्यक्तं, विपरीतमव्यक्तम् ॥ *Sāṅkhyakārikā* 10 and *Tattvakaumudī* on it.
3. त्रिगुणमविवेकि विषयः सामान्यमचेतनं प्रसवधर्मि । व्यक्तं, तथा प्रधानं तद्विपरीतं तथा च पुमान् ॥ *Sāṅkhyakārikā* 11.

or creative substances, active or mobile,[1] multiform (since consciousness et cetera differ in each individual and also, for example, the earth has many shapes like those of the jar et cetera), dependent on the causes, characterstic or predicative of the unmanifest, conjunct i. e. composed of parts, and subordinate being in the need of the rootless unmanifest (Nature or Prakṛti) in the completion of the production of its effect. The Unmanifest is just the reverse—it is uncaused, eternal, pervading, immobile (being universal, though, it possesses the action of evolution or development of the phenomenal realities called the manifests), single, independent or self-sufficient, unconjunct being connate with all the evolutes or manifested objects and non-subservient (i.e. supreme) as the only cause abiding in all the 'vyaktas'. Now, coming to the similarities between the unmanifest (prakṛti) and its effects (vikṛtis) they are both constituted by the same three attributes (guṇas), are indiscriminating, objective, generic (or common for several spirits or puruṣas), non-intelligent or insentient, and creative or prolific. These similarities, therefore, coustitute the basic conception or nature of reality in the material objects of the universe, which are all evolved or manifested out of a final cause viz., the Unmanifest. We find that the different objects in the universe possess all these characterstics as detailed above.

But, the three attributes which are called the essence or part and parcel, and, hence, give a wholesome common identity to all these principles (i.e. both to the cause—Prakṛti and to the manifests—the effects),[2] are traditionally assigned paramount importance in the theory of creation according to this school. This is why, prakṛti or the creative principle as well as its vikṛtis or the evolutes, are both termed triguṇa i.e. known as consisting of the following three guṇas or

---

1. See f. n. 2, p 93. The Buddhi etc. migrate to the new bodies leaving the previous ones The mobility of earth is too well-known.
2. सत्त्वादीनामतद्धर्मत्वं तद्रूपत्वात् *Sāṅkhyasūtra* 6.39; एते गुणाः प्रधानशब्दवाच्या भवन्ति *Yogabhāṣya* on *Yogasūtra* 2.18; *Sāṅkhyakārikā* 10.

attributes : Goodness (*sattva*), Foulness (*rajas*) and Darkness (*tamas*). The designation guṇa is applied to them as they serve the purpose of others (i.e., that of the puruṣas or living beings).[1]

The three attributes are the only real material cause of the entire objective universe. In order to prove their existence the exponents of the Sāṅkhyayoga school point out that all the objects of the world are of the threefold nature of love or pleasure (prīti), aversion or pain (aprīti), and stupefication or delusion (viṣāda). These attributes are not subjective or negations of one another and exist as entities in each object independently whether in a prominent or a subdued state. For example, a single girl—young, beautiful, gentle and virtuous is a source of pleasure to her husband, that of pain to her co-wives, and that of delusion to another man who is unable to get at her because she has in essence all the three constituent attributes. In this way, the same thorns pinch ordinary men, delight the camels and also possess the essence of delusion for a monk (vītarāgin). Now, these very concrete characterstics in the manifested (vyakta) effects must be presupposed to owe their existence to the same attributes in the unmanifest nature or cause (avyakta prakṛti or kāraṇa). Needless to say, the sattva etc. are technical names, designations of the entities which have been shown in the Sāṅkhyayoga school to respectively possess the above characterstics.[2]

---

1. गुणाः इति परार्थाः...*Sāṅkhyatattvakaumudī* on *Sāṅkhyakārikā* 12.
2. अत्र च सुखदुःखमोहाः परस्परविरोधिनः स्वस्वानुरूपाणि सुखदुःखमोहात्मकान्येव निमित्तानि कल्पयन्ति....तत्र यत् सुखहेतुः तत्सुखात्मकं सत्त्वम्, यत् दुःखहेतुस्तत् दुःखात्मकं रजः यन्मोहहेतुस्तन्मोहात्मकं तमः ।। *Sāṅkhyatattvakaumudī* on *Sāṅkhyakārikā* 13. Cf. these lines with *Bhāmatī* on *Śāṁkarabhāṣya* 2.2 1 : एवं कण्टकः क्रमेलकस्य सुख इति मनुष्यादीनामपि प्राणभृतां सुखः स्यात् । न ह्यसौ कांश्चित् प्रत्येव कण्टक इति । तस्मादसुखादिस्वभावा अपि चन्दनकुङ्कुमादयो जातिकालावस्थाद्यपेक्षया सुखदुः खादिहेतवो, न तु स्वयं सुखादिस्वभावा इति रमणीयम् । However, merit (dharma) and demerit (adharma) impressions of the spirits (puruṣas) are responsible for the predominance of sukha etc. in the particular cases according to this school.

To evolve ultimately as pleasure, pain and delusion for the experience of the living beings (puruṣas) is the main purpose of these attributes, for which they function as agents or factors of illumination, activity and restraint.[1] When one attribute is prominent due to some external cause it subdues the other two. For example, goodness attains to its peaceful state only after having subdued foulness (or passion) and darkness. In the same manner the other two attain to their respectively terrible and stupid conditions or status after having subdued the other two. Each attribute is necessarily supported by the other two in its functioning. For example, goodness by itself without the touch of foulness (i. e. activity) would remain inert and never be moved to action, and without restraint (a function of the third attribute) would never cease to function even when it is no longer required.[2] The attributes also mutually help each other during the equilibrium state (sāmyāvasthā or pralaya) of the unmanifest or nature, even when each is functioning although no diverse creation or evolution takes place.[3] According to the concept of pariṇāma (as discussed earlier), nothing that was not can or will exist and hence the functioning or causal operation of the attributes even in their own pure undisturbed state has got to be accepted. Any one or two of these cannot

---

1. प्रीत्यप्रीतिविषादात्मकाः प्रकाशप्रवृत्तिनियमार्थाः । अन्योऽन्याभिभवाश्रयजननमिथुनवृत्तयश्च ॥ *Sāṅkhyakārikā* 12 and *Sāṅkhyatattvakaumudī* as well as *Sāṅkhyacandrikā* on it.
2. Cf. त्रिदण्डविष्टम्भवदमी वेदितव्या इति *Māṭharavṛtti* p. 22, and इमे गुणाः परस्पराश्रयाः सर्वकार्यकरणसमर्थाः, यथा त्रिदण्डी परस्पराश्रया कुण्डकादीन् अवष्टभ्नाति *Suvarṇasāptatiśāstra* (Chinese version, translated into Sanskrit by अय्यास्वामी शास्त्री) p. 17 as have been quoted by Dr. A. P. Mishra in his *Sāṅkhyatattvakaumudī Prabhā* (Satya Parkashan, Allahabad 2nd Ed. 1962) (avataraṇikā) p. 47.
3. *Sāṅkhyatattvakaumudī* on the term 'अन्योन्यजननवृत्तय;' of *Sāṅkhyakārikā* 12; Cf. also ibid on *Sāṅkhyakārikā* 10 where सक्रियम् has been explained as परिस्पन्दवत्; Cf. Also 'विद्वत्तोषिणी' on *Sāṅkhyakārikā* 10.

exist without the rest. They are always together and have a joint existence.[1]

VI. The Uniform Pattern of Pariṇāma During the Period of Dissolution (Pralaya)

We have noted in the previous section that the three attributes are constantly evolutionary in character during a state of equilibrium (sāmyāvasthā) which is not conducing to the diversity of production or creation as found in the universe because the attributes are producing pariṇāma similar to their own nature which remains one and the same. The Rajas attribute in the unmanifest primordial (mūla) matter or Nature (prakṛti) cannot allow the latter to remain idle. Thus, at the time of dissolution the attributes continue to have similar modification (i. e. have uniform nature) and they have no change of form as such. How do the various pariṇāmas or effects like the elements, the intellect etc. take place or begin to evolve during the universal creation? We have noted above that the attributes also operate by blending which, however, is not possible in the uniform method of operation belonging to them during the dissolution. Hence, the blending and mutual suppression (aṅgāṅgibhāva) of the attributes, are necessary prerequisites for the process of evolution or creation to start. The diversity of evolution of a substance of uniform nature

---

[1] अविनाभाववृत्तयः इति यावत् *Sāṅkhyatattvakaumudī* on *Sāṅkhyakārikā* 12; Cf. अन्योन्यमिथुना सर्वे सर्वे सर्वत्रगामिनः। रजसो मिथुनं सत्त्वं सत्त्वस्य मिथूनं रजः ॥ तमसश्चापि मिथुनं ते सत्त्वरजसी उभे। उभयोः सत्त्वरजसोर्मिथुनं तम उच्यते। नैषामादिः सम्प्रयोगो वियोगो वोपलभ्यते ॥ *Devībhāgavata* 3.8. However, some commentators have combined the epithet वृत्ति independently with अन्योऽन्य only and not with each preceding word i. e. with 'आश्रय' etc. The import of the *Sāṅkhyakārikā* then will be that each attribute is also capable of performing the function of others i. e., अन्यः अन्यस्य कार्यं करोति Cf. *Māṭharavṛtti* and Sanskrit Translation of सुवर्णसप्ततिशास्त्र (Chinese version) quoted on pp. 183-184 of *Sāṅkhyatattvakaumudīprabhā* by Dr. A. P. Mishra.

(or taste for that matter) has traditionally been illustrated by the water of the clouds which becomes sweet, bitter, sour etc. as it comes into contact with the differnt modifications such as the coconut, wood-apple etc. In the latter case the diversity or difference in the modifiications of earth are already present before the diversity of evolution takes place but in the former case the relation of subordination or being prominent and subsidiaries respectively cannot be proved to exist prior to the evolution of the diverse forms of cosmic manifestation.

VII. The Purpose and Process of Creation

This relationship of inequality or suppression of the attributes among themselves takes place for the benefit (or due to the urgent requirements)[1] of the spirits or conscious beings (puruṣas) who are postulated as supervisors or experiencers of the created objects, which are inert and possess the characteristics of pleasure, pain and delusion as discussed above. Again, all composite (so called due to their being composed of the attributes) objects, e. g., the unmanifest (nature) and the intellect etc. are meant for another's use like the chair, bed etc.[2] Also, the orthodox tradition of scriptures etc. mentions the concept of and illustrations during the various stages for the attainment of final beatitude – which according to this school consists of the abstraction of the spirit from material existence.[3] The experience of pleasure etc. (viz., bhoga), and ultimate and real separate existence from all forms of matter or the objective realities (i. e. the primordial matter and its manifestations) are the

1. The attributes work towards a common purpose : प्रदीपवच्चार्थतो वृत्तिः *Sāṅkhya-kārikā* 13; स्वां स्वां प्रतिपद्यन्ते परस्पराकूतहेतुकां वृत्तिम् । पुरुषार्थ एव हेतुर्न केनचित् कार्यते करणम् ।। *Sāṅkhyakārikā* 31; *Yogasūtra* 4.14
2. *Sāṅkhyakārikā* 17 and *Tattvakaumudī* on it.
3 तदा द्रष्टु स्वरूपेऽवस्थानम् *Yogasūtra* 1.3.

twofold purpose of all creation (sṛṣṭi) according to the Sāṅkhyayoga school.

We have seen that the aim of creation is to serve the twofold interests of spirits as well as known that the unintelligent Prakṛti actively manifests the objects for the same. Hence, all the apparent creation, functioning or operation ('ārambha' or 'ceṣṭā') of the Prakṛti involved in the process of the creation of all the products from Buddhi downwards to specific elements is practically meant for others. Prakṛti cannot practically serve its own sake,[1] for, it is not intelligent or conscious (although theoretically it may be said to do so in the act of creation).[2] One may point out that at least an intelligent supervisor must be accepted to make the activity or functioning of of an inert object (like that of a common object of experience say jar, spinning wheel, glass of water etc.) feasible and understandable. To this the Sāṅkhyayoga replies that there are instances when insentient or inert (acetana) objects can act for a definite end. It is pointed out that the Prakṛti operates towards the emancipation of the spirit even as the milk flows out for the growth of the calf.[3] After the purpose of Puruṣa viz., that of distinctive knowledge or self-realization, has been served Prakṛti desists from operating with regard to that particular conscious being (i. e. the Puruṣa) even as a dancing girl, having exhibited herself to the spectators of the stage, ceases to dance.[4] The Sāṅkhyayoga school postulates the image of a loyal and useful servant who accomplishes much good for his unqualified master through purely unselfish motives, to explain the allegorical generosity of Prakṛti or its attributes by the means of manifold evolutions with respect to the disinterested and 'as-if-ungrateful' Puruṣa.[1]

---

[1] *Sāṅkhyakārikā* 58.

[2] इत्येष प्रकृतिकृतो महदादिविशेषभूतपर्यन्तः । प्रतिपुरुषविमोक्षार्थं स्वार्थ इव परार्थ आरम्भः ॥
Sāṅkhyakārikā 56.

[3] *Sāṅkhyakārikā* 57.

[4] *Sāṅkhyakārikā* 59.

For the realisation of the above aims the disturbance (kṣobha) in the attributes' uniform existence or equilibrium takes place resulting in the varied and myriad modifications and evolutions from their unmanifest state. The comparative suppression and prominence or inequalites among the attributes (known as *vaiṣamyas*) result from this disturbance of harmony (i. e. *vimarda* or kṣobha).[2] In this way the uniform or causal state of the three attributes in the pre-phenomenal or unmanifest stage is able to manifest a variety of effects in the process of creation according to the Sāṅkhyayoga theory of creation from the Unmanifest (i. e. Avyakta or Prakṛti); the unmanifest cause changes into the innumerable manifest effects.

But, the realisation of the above purpose (i. e., kṣobha) is made possible through the contact of the subjective spirit (puruṣa) and the objective matter (prakṛti) alone.[3] The two are really different but due to ignorance (avidyā)[4] which is beginningless, the attributes

---

1. *Sāṅkhyakārikā* 60.
2. *Sāṅkhyakārikā* 46.
3. पुरुषस्य दर्शनार्थं कैवल्यार्थं तथा प्रधानस्य । पङ्ग्वन्धवदुभयोरपि संयोगस्तत्कृतः सर्गः ॥ *Sāṅkhyakārikā* 21; See *Yogasūtra* 2.23 together with *Bhāṣya* for a full discussion of '*saṁyoga*'.
4. तस्य हेतुरविद्या । *Yogasūtra* 2.24 and the *Bhāṣya* on it : यस्तु प्रत्यक्चेतनस्य स्वबुद्धिसंयोगः तस्य हेतुरविद्या । विपर्ययज्ञानवासनेत्यर्थः । विपर्ययज्ञानवासनावासिता च न कार्यनिष्ठां पुरुषख्यातिं बुद्धिः प्राप्नोति साधिकारा पुनरावर्तते । सा तु पुरुषख्यातिपर्यवसानां कार्यनिष्ठां प्राप्नोति । चरिताधिकारा निवृत्तादर्शना बन्धकारणाभावान्न पुनरावर्तते । This vāsanā or natural inclination towards wrong or 'non' knowledge has been defined in *Yogasūtra* 2.5 as अनित्याशुचिदुःखानात्मसु नित्यशुचिसुखात्मख्यातिरविद्या ॥ It is something anti or opposite to knowledge but basically a positive substance. Cf. the concluding portion of the interesting *bhāṣya* on the above : यथा चागोष्पदं न गोष्पदाभावो न गोष्पदमात्रं किन्तु देश एव ताभ्यामन्यद्वस्त्वन्तरम् । एवमविद्या न प्रमाणं न प्रमाणाभावः । किन्तु विद्याविपरीतं ज्ञानान्तरमविद्येति ॥

and through them their characteristics of pleasure, pain etc. are apparently identified by the Spirit (puruṣa) to be their own.[1] This beginningless chain of apparent identification is technically known as *saṁyoga.* The knowledge of the difference between Matter and Spirit, too, is caused by another saṁyoga between them.[2] Ignorance (i. e. mistaken or apparent identification between the essentially opposite realities of Matter (*acit*) and Spirit (*cit*)) and knowledge (i. e. that of the difference between them viz., *prakṛti-puruṣa-viveka*) are both characteristics of Intellect, the Great Principle, which is the first evolute of the unmanifest, and, hence, both the bhoga and *apavarga* which ultimately and apparently benefit the Puruṣa, actually, belong to the Prakṛti itself in the Sāṅkhyayoga school.[3] The Puruṣa neither experiences nor does anything. His mere proximity[1] to the Prakṛti is the root of the mistaken identification between Himself and the Prakṛti[2], whence He appears as benefitted in the above two ways.[3]

---

[1] वृत्तिसारूप्यमितरत्र *Yogasūtra* 1.4 and its *Bhāṣya.*

[2] Cf. *Tattvakaumudī* on *Sāṅkhyakārikā* 21 : अनादित्वाच्च संयोगपरम्पराया भोगाय संयुक्तोऽपि पुनः संयुज्यत इत्युक्तम् ।। But the *Yogasūtras* 2 25,26 hold that it is the cessation or absence of contact and not a fresh contact which causes कैवल्य (cf. *Tatkṛtaḥ sargaḥ* in *Sāṅkhyakārikā* 21) which, again, is itself caused by avidyā - due to the operation or manifestation of the 8th mode of Prakṛti (Cf *Sāṅkhyakārikā* 63) viz., that of the differentiating or distinctive knowledge (i e *tattvajñāna* or *sattvapuruṣānyatākhyāti*). The view of Vācaspati, therefore, does not appear to be in accordance with the basic tenets of the school (cf. *Vyāsabhāṣya* also on the above-mentioned *sūtras*). Even the *Sāṅkhyakārikā* does not apparently corraborate Vācaspati's view. Although *Sāṅkhyakārikā* 66 admits that saṁyoga does exist even after the fulfilment of the puruṣārthas, yet the absence of *Viparyaya* (i. e. wrong knowledge) which consists of avidyā et cetera (vide *Sāṅkhyakārikā* 47), referred to in the same *kārikā* clearly implies that even saṁyoga which is caused by avidyā must also cease to exist before the Kaivalya.

[3] तस्मान्न बध्यतेऽद्धा न मुच्यते नापि संसरति कश्चित् । संसरति बध्यते मुच्यते च नानाश्रया प्रकृतिः ।। *Sāṅkhyakārikā* 62. Cf. also *Yogasūtra* 4.34; सर्वं प्रत्युपभोगम् यस्मात्पुरुषस्य साधयति बुद्धिः । सैव च विशिनष्टि पुनः प्रधानपुरुषान्तरं सूक्ष्मम् ।। *Sāṅkhyakārikā* 37; रूपैः सप्तभिरेव तु बध्नात्यामानमात्मना प्रकृतिः सैव च पुरुषार्थम्प्रति विमोचयत्येकरूपेण ।। *Sāṅkhyakārikā*

VIII. The Insentient Prakṛti as The Creative Factor and Its Relationship with the Puruṣa

There is anobjection, however, to this theory of creation. Consciousness (caitanya) and activity (kriyā) are always found together or co-existent. The one without the other is inconceivable in common experience. We think rightly, therefore, that only an intelligent being can act and that all creation is made possible through action alone. In the Sāṅkhyayoga theory of creation, however, we find that the intelligent spirit is indifferent as an active agent of creation while the creative or active principle (i. e. the Unmanifest) is devoid of intelligence or consciousness. That is why, we see that conscious emotions viz., pleasure, pain etc. are apparently manifested in the

---

63; Also see *Tattvakaumudī* on ibid for a lucid expositon of how the Buddhi (the great principle)—the first evolute of the unmanifest—for that matter serves, the ends of the Spirits or the souls.

1. (दर्शितविषयत्वात्) वृत्तिसारूप्यमितरत्र ।।...व्युत्थाने याश्चित्तवृत्तयस्तदविशिष्टवृत्तिः पुरुषः । तथा च सूत्रम् 'एकमेव दर्शनं ख्यातिरेव दर्शनम् इति । चित्तमयस्कान्तमणिकल्पं संनिधिमात्रोपकारि दृश्यत्वेन स्वं भवति पुरुषस्य स्वामिनः (भोगसाधनत्वात्) तस्माच्चित्तवृत्तिबोधे पुरुषस्यानादिः सम्वन्धो हेतुः । *Yogabhāṣya* on *Yogasūtra* 1.4; *'vyutthāna'* is the technical name for the apparently experiencing or baddha state and *'khyāti'* or *'darśana'* is the technical name for the state of 'seeing' or realization of distinctness or aloofness.
2. यतश्चैतन्यकर्तृत्वे भिन्नाधिकरणे युक्तितः सिद्धे तस्मात् भ्रान्तिरियमित्यर्थः...भ्रान्तिबीजं तत्सन्निधानम् *Tattvakaumudī* on *Sāṅkhyakārikā* 20.
3. तस्मात्तत्संयोगादचेतनं चेतनावदिव लिंगम् । गुणकर्तृत्वे च तथा कर्तेव भवत्युदासीनः ।। *Sāṅkhya-kārikā* 20; Cf. ibid 64 and 66; Cf. the beautiful and apt image of such a phenomenon as conveyed in *Yogasūtra* 1.41, 2.20 and 2.21 as well as *Sāṅkhyakārikā* 59, 61 and 66.

unintelligent Prakṛti and that the doership or consciousness (which is necessary for any action, much more so for creation) is the apparent characteristic of the Unmanifest in the actual process of creation. In other words, the confusion (bhrānti) regarding the apparent assumption of the alien characteristic of consciousness in the unintelligent Prakṛti, and, that of activity and the characteristics (i. e. experiences, like pleasure etc.) of the attributes constituting the Unmanifest in the inactive Puruṣa have to be explained. This is made possible directly through contact (saṁyoga) and indirectly by ignorance or wrong identification (avidyā) by way of the special relationship of the helper and the helped[1] that mutually exists between the Prakṛti and the Puruṣa, the jaḍa and the cetana, the former comparable to a devoted servant and the latter to a master. It is, therefore, that the Puruṣa and the Prakṛti have been variously described as svāmin and *sva*,[2] as draṣṭṛ or *dṛkśakti* and dṛśya[3] or *darśanśakti*,[4] as Puruṣa and *Sattva*[5] and even as darśaka and naṭī.[6]

Thus, avidyā, saṁyoga and kṣobha are significant stages or postulates for the theory of creation as propounded in the Sāṅkhyayoga school.

IX. Vijñānabhikṣu's View Refuted

But, Vijñānabhikṣu has a different version about the stages immediately preceding the phenomenon of creation. According to this, after kṣobha there is saṁyoga and then creation takes place.[1] But, this view is clearly untenable and unnatural, because saṁyoga, being beginningless due to the similar characteristic of avidyā which causes it, cannot and does not require kṣobha as a cause. Kṣobha is required to explain and justify the various dissimilar creations or pariṇāmas during the universal evolution (sṛṣṭi) and, therefore, it is directly or immediately productive of creation proper, there is no need to bring in saṁyoga (at a later stage) which is the common cause of both the similar (i. e. those during the equilibrium or rest) as well as the dissimilar creations as we have discussed above. That the beginningless saṁyoga is a later stage before universal creation as compared to kṣobha is, in this way, unmaintainable. The view of Vijñānabhikṣu is easily refuted.

---

[1] *Sāṅkhyakārikā* 20-21 and *Tattvakaumudi* thereon; Cf. also : यद्यपि तस्य हेतुरविद्येति योगसूत्रेणानादिविपर्ययज्ञानवासनैव संयोगनिदानमभिहितं तथाप्यवान्तरं संयोगप्रगोजकं परस्परोपकारमाह । *Vidvattoṣiṇī* quoted on p. 221 of *Sāṅkhyatattvakaumudīprabhā.*

[2] स्वस्वामिशक्त्योः स्वरूपोपलब्धिहेतुः संयोगः *Yogasūtra* 2.23.

[3] प्रकाशक्रियास्थितिशीलं भूतेन्द्रियात्मकं भोगापवर्गार्थं दृश्यम् । *Yogasūtra* 2.18; ibid, 2.17; ibid, 4.23

[4] दृग्दर्शनशक्त्योरेकात्मतैवास्मिता *Yogasūtra* 2.6.

[5] Ibid 3.48; ibid, 3.54.

[6] *Sāṅkhyakārikā* 59.

X. *The Order of Creation*

Regarding the order of creation, it is said, that from Prakṛti issues *Mahat* (or Buddhi i. e. intellect), from this Mahat issues *Ahaṁkāra* (i. e. self-consciousness or egoism) from which proceeds the set of the sixteen, and from five of those latter, again, proceed the five gross elements.

Mahat is the determining principle (i. e. will) and has eight variant forms : Virtue (dharma), Wisdom (jñāna), Dispassion (vairāgya) and Power (aiśvarya) when predominantly affected by the attribute of *Sattva* and the reverse four (i e. Vice etc.) when equally dominated by the attribute of *Tamas*.

Ahaṁkāra is the creative principle or cause in respect to the eleven Indriyas (sense-organs) viz , (1) the intellectual organs—the Eye, the Ear, the Nose, the Tongue and the Skin, (2) those of action—Speech, Hands, Feet, the excretory organ and the organ of generation or reproduction, and (3) the Manas which is both an intellectual organ as well as that of action—when predominated by the attribute of Sattva[1] on the one hand, and, of the five *Tanmātras* (i. e. subtle or primary elements) viz., sound (śabda), touch (sparśa), colour (rūpa), taste (rasa) and smell (gandha) when predominated by the attribute of Tamas on the other. Thus, there is two-fold creation simultaneously out of Ahaṁkāra.[2]

---

[1] *Sāṅkhyapravacanabhāaṣya* by *Vijñānabhikṣu* 5.101.

The creation of the indriyas from the Sāttvika aspect of Ahaṁkāra, as mentioned above, has got good support from Vācaspati Miśra. According to him, the comparative degree of high, low and lower still capacities respectively to illumine or grasp the objects, or that of being quick and light by themselves, belonging (1) to the Manas, (2) to the intellectual sense-organs and (3) to those of action—clearly establish a gradation among the three. Thus, very high, high and small degrees of the Sattva aspect respectively get manifested in these three groups of modified (*vaikṛta*) Ahaṁkāra.

Regarding the creation or evolution of the indriyas there also exists another viewpoint viz., that held by Vijñānabhikṣu.[3] According to this, the manas alone is dominated by Sattva, while the other ten indriyas cited above evolve out of the predominantly Rajas aspect of Ahaṁkara. Now the fact that prakāśakatva or characteristic of illuminating or making known is not found either in the gross elements or the physical objects of the world or even in their (i. e. the bhūtas' or elements') primary or elemental state due to the comparative predominance of Tamas (which is āvaraka or covering and weighty etc.) and also due to the suppressing of the attribute of Sattva does explain the fact of their having dominant Tamas aspect of modified Ahaṁkāra. Likewise, we may be able to explain above the predominance of Sattva aspect, as opposed to the Tamas one, in the case of all the indriyas according to the viewpoint held by Vācaspati Miśra.[1]

---

[1] सात्त्विकाहङ्कारोपादानकत्वमिन्द्रियत्वम् *Tattvakaumudī* on *Sāṅkhyakārikā* 26; प्रकाशलाघवाभ्यामेकादशक इन्द्रियगणः सात्त्विको वैकृतात् सात्त्विकाहङ्कारात् प्रवर्तते, भूतादेस्त्वहङ्कारात् तामसाद् तन्मात्रो गणः प्रवर्तते ।...तैजसात् राजसादुभयं गणद्वयं भवति । यद्यपि रजसो न कार्यान्तरमस्ति, तथापि सत्त्वतमसी स्वयमक्रिये समर्थेऽपि न स्वस्वकार्यं कुरुतः, रजस्तु चलतया यदा ते चालयति तदा स्वकार्यं कुरुत इति । *Tattvakaumudī* on *Sāṅkhyakārikā* 25; Cf. सात्त्विकमेकादशकं प्रवर्तते वैकृतादहङ्कारात् *Sāṅkhyasūtra* 2.18.

[2] *Sāṅkhyakārikā* 22-26.

[3] विज्ञानभिक्षु has also quoted the following passages from Purāṇa etc. in support of his view in his commentary on *Sāṅkhyasūtra* 2.18 : वैकारिकास्तैजसश्च तामसश्चेत्यहं त्रिधा । अहन्तत्त्वाद्विकुर्वाणान्मनो वैकारिकादभूत् ।। वैकारिकाश्च ये देवा अर्थाभिव्यञ्जनं यतः । तेजासानीन्द्रियाण्येव ज्ञानकर्ममयानि च ।। तामसो भूतसूक्ष्मादियंतः खं लिङ्गमात्मनः ।। *Bhāgavata* 3.5.30-32 and सात्त्विको राजसश्चैव तामसश्च त्रिधा महान् । *Mārkaṇḍeyapurāṇa* 45. 38; ibid 16.2-4 etc.

We also know that the attribute of Rajas is a necessary factor in any modifications to be evolved whether they are dominated by Sattva or Tamas which (i. e. the latter two attributes) by themselves are ineffective or inoperative.[2] The Rajas, thus, is not only as much helpful or complementary to the dominating operation or manifestation of the attribute of Sattva as to that of Tamas, but, also a common activising or motivating factor in the evolutionary or creative operation of all the three attributes taken together. That is why, Rajas is rather a common basis in both predominantly Sāttvic and Tāmasa objects.[3] Īśvarakṛṣṇa who is equally quoted or accepted as an authority by both Vijñānabhikṣu and Vācaspati Miśra, decidedly and justifiably, therefore, differentiates between the two-fold creations of Ahaṁkāra, the one is the group of eleven and the other is the group of five primary elements.[4] Hence, by the terms *taijasādubhayam* in the very next *Kārikā* he must be expressing the fact of both of these creations being the effects of Rajas. Vijñānabhikṣu's view that only the last two divisions of the 'sense-organs' are referred to here is clearly misconceived as the division of the sense-organs into three is given after this *Kārikā* and not before it.[1]

---

[1] See *Sāṅkhyatattvakaumudīprabhā*, p. 143.

[2] *Sāṅkhyakārikā* 25 and *Tattvakaumudī* on it.

[3] Ibid.

[4] *Sāṅkhyakārikā* 24.

Next, the basis of holding only twofold division of Āhaṁkārika creation cannot be maintained according to Vijñānabhikṣu's view, for, he implies a threefold division viz., Sāttvika (or vaikārika), Rājasa (or Taijasa) and Tāmasa.[2]

Even the *Sāṅkhyasūtra*[3] clearly supports the view of Īśvarakṛṣṇa and Vācaspati as the standard viewpoint of the school. The view of Vijñānabhikṣu that *'ekādaśakam'* means 'the eleventh' and not the group of eleven is untenable. The author of *Sāṅkhyasūtra* has not only differentiated and separately stated the group of eleven and that of five[4] but has also immediately afterwards[5] unmistakably defined the denotation of *ekādaśakam* as to be the eleven indriyas taken together.

There is not sufficient ground, therefore, to prove that the indriyas are predominantly Rājasa as against Sāttvika. Hence, the view of Vācaspati Miśra appears to conform to the true traditions of the Sāṅkhyayoga school.

Each of the *tanmātras* manifests one gross physical substance (bhūta).[6] In this way, are created or manifested the ether (ākāśa)

---

1. See *Sāṅkhyapravacanabhāṣya* 2.18.
2. Ibid.
3. *Sāṅkhyasūtra* 2.18.
4. एकादशपञ्चतन्मात्रं तत्कार्यम् ।। Ibid 2.17.
5. कर्मेन्द्रियबुद्धीन्द्रियैरान्तरमेकादशकम् ।। Ibid 2.19.
6. तन्मात्राण्यविशेषास्तेभ्यो भूतानि पञ्च पञ्चभ्यः । एते स्मृता विशेषाः शान्ता घोराश्च मूढाश्च ।। *Sāṅkhyakārikā* 38; शब्दादितन्मात्राणि सूक्ष्माणि । न चैषां शान्तत्वादिरस्ति उपभोगयोग्यविशेष इति मात्रशब्दार्थः । ''यस्मादाकाशादिषु स्थूलेषु सत्त्वप्रधानतया केचिच्छान्ताः सुखाः प्रकाशाः लघवः, केचिद्रजःप्रधानतया घोराः दुःखा अनवस्थिताः केचित्तमःप्रधानतया मूढा विषण्णा

from the śabdatanmātra, the air (vāyu) from the sparśatanmātra, the fire (agni) from the rūpatanmātra, the water (jala) from the rasatanmātra, and earth (pṛthivī) from the gandhatanmātra respectively. The tanmātras are subtle and without the specific characteristics (i. e. the *viśeṣas*) which are manifested in the gross physical substances (bhūtas) which, again, are created by them (i. e. the tanmātras). The grossness of the bhūtas consists in the manifestation of their characteristically calm or soothing (śānta), turbulent or terrific (ghora) and deluding (mūḍha) nature.

It is interesting, here, to note, that while the five ultimate (i. e. the minutest possible) physical elements or bhūtas of the Nyāyavaiśeṣika school consist of the substance and its inherent specific quality,[1] according to this school, the bhūtas are the grossest possible products from where they start their enquiry into the yet more minute substances which manifest or produce them (i. e. the bhūtas) according to their theory of creation.

Hence, the school does not believe in any fresh principle or manifest object (vyakta tattva) after these bhūtas. Although the whole universe consisting of so many phenomenal appearances is moulded out of these gross elements (i. e. the mahābhūtas viz., ākāśa et cetera), yet all such objects, e. g. the jar, the tree et cetera are not at all essentially (*tattvataḥ*) different from pṛthivī et cetera according to this school because of the fact that both the mahābhūtas and their so-called products are gross and cognizable by the sense-organs.[2]

गुरवः । तेऽमी परस्परव्यावृत्त्याऽनुभूयमाना 'विशेषा' इति च 'स्थूला' इति चोच्यन्ते । तन्मात्राणि तु अस्मदादिभिः परस्परव्यावृत्तानि नानुभूयन्ते इति अविशेषा इति सूक्ष्मा इति चोच्यन्ते । *Tattvakaumudī* on Ibid.

1. e.g. पृथ्वी परमाणु = पृथ्वी द्रव्य + गन्ध, आकाश परमाणु = आकाश द्रव्य + शब्द and so on and so forth.

2. यद्यपि च पृथिव्यादीनां गोघटवृक्षादयो विकाराः एवं तद्विकारभेदानां पयोबीजादीनां दध्यङ्कुरादयः, तथापि गवादयो बीजादयो वा न पृथिव्यादिभ्यस्तत्त्वान्तरम् । तत्त्वान्तरोपादानत्वं च प्रकृतित्वम्

This is the order in which the twentythree principles are created or manifested from the unmanifest.

XI. The Divisions of Creation

(*A*) *Pertaining to the intellect*

The intellect or principle of thinking (viz., buddhi or *pratyaya*) which is the first product (vikṛti) in the order of universal creation as referred to in the last section, is that by which one determines or arrives at definite thoughts.[1] It has eight modes or forms (vṛttis) one of which is (1) avidyā or ajñāna[2] (ignorance) whose role as a necessary factor before the process of creation begins, we have already examined.[3] Another form of pratyaya or buddhi namely (2) jñāna (knowledge) is helpful for, and, therefore, causes the liberation or final emancipation of the spirit.[4] The remaining forms viz., those of (3) adharma (vice or demerit), (4) dharma (virtue or merit), (5) vairāgya (dispassion), (6) rāga (passion), (7) aiśvarya (power or affluence), and (8) anaiśvarya (weakness or inability) are responsible for migration to lower regions (lokas), for migration to higher lokas, for absorption into Prakṛti, for assuming and leaving the gross body (cf. the concept of *āvāgamana* or the cakra of janma and mṛtyu), for non-obstruction (i. e. fulfilment) of all desires, and for their frequent obstruction (unfulfilment) respectively.[5]

इहाभिप्रेतमिति न दोषः । सर्वेषां गोघटादीनां स्थूलता इन्द्रियग्राह्यता च समेति न तत्त्वान्तरत्वम् । *Sāṅkhyatattvakaumudī* on *Sāṅkhyakārikā* 3.

[1] प्रतीयतेऽनेनेति प्रत्ययो बुद्धिः *Tattvakaumudī* on *Sāṅkhyakārikā* 46; 'अध्यवसायो बुद्धिः' क्रियाक्रियावतोरभेदविवक्षया *Sāṅkhyakārika* 23 and *Tattvakaumudī* on ibid.

[2] Cf *Suṣamā* p. 156 quoted on page 289 of *Sāṅkhyatattvakaumudīprabhā*.

[3] See section VII earlier.

[4] ज्ञानेन चापवर्गः *Sāṅkhyakārikā* 44 and *Tattvakaumudī* on it.

[5] Due to the apparent difference of manifestation among them these types can also be called pariṇāmas (evolutes) of the intellect.

But, the creation pertaining to the intellect has been traditionally said to consist of four kinds viz., those of error (*viparyaya*), disability (*aśakti*), contentment (*tuṣṭi*) and perfection (*siddhi*). These four have as many as five, twentyeight, nine and eight subdivisions respectively. Thus, in all, fifty forms or evolutes of the intellect may be enumerated as follows.

(1) *Viparyaya* or ajñāna (error) is of five kinds viz.[1], ignorance (avidyā); egotism (asmitā), passion (rāga), hatred (dveṣa) and attachment to the body (abhiniveśa) which are respectively called (1) *tamas* (obscurity), (2) *moha* (delusion), (3) *mahāmoha* (extreme delusion), (4) *tāmisra* (gloom), and (5) *andhatāmisra* (utter darkness).[2] Again, the first two of these are of eight types each, the third kind is further subdivided into ten and the last two (i. e. (4) and (5)) consist of eighteen subdivisions each. Thus, in all, viparyaya has as many as sixty-two forms.[3]

(2) Aśakti (disability) has twentyeight subdivisions consisting of the various injuries of the intellect arising out of the paralysis or destruction (vadha) of the eleven indriyas viz., blindness (andhatva), deafness (bādhirya), failure of the sensibility of the olfactory nerves (*ajighratā*), that of the organ of taste, leprosy (kuṣṭhitā), dumbness (mūkatā), paralysis of the hands, lameness (paṅgutva), failure of the action of bowels (*gudāvarta*), impotency (*klaivyatva*) and idiocy

---

[1] See *Yogasūtra* and *Bhāṣya* 2. 3-9 for an elaborate description of viparyaya or ajñāna and its five kinds (which are known as kleśas as well).

[2] See *Tattvakaumudī* on *Sāṅkhyakārikā* 47; Cf. also *Viṣṇupurāṇa* 1.5.5. तमो मोहो महामोहो तामिस्रो ह्यन्धसंज्ञकः । अविद्या पंचपर्वैपा प्रादुर्भूता महात्मनः ।।

[3] See *Sāṅkhyakārikā* 48 and *Tattvakaumudī* as well as *Suṣamā*, *Vidvattoṣiṇī* and *Kiraṇāvalī* on it for a detailed description.

(pramāda),—as well as of those arising out of the absence or lack of the nine kinds of tuṣṭi and the eight kinds of siddhi.[1]

(3) Tuṣṭi (contentment) of the intellect is of nine kinds : viz., the four internal ones relating severally to nature (prakṛti), means (*upādānas*), time (kāla) and luck (prārabdha or bhāgya) as well as the five external ones relating to abstinence from or detachment to the objects of the senses (viz., sound, touch, form or scene, flavour and odour).[2] These nine tuṣṭis are also technically known as *ambha, salila, ogha, vṛṣṭi, pāra, supāra, pārāpāra, anuttamāmbha* and *uttamāmbha* in the Sāṅkhyayoga school.[3]

(4) Siddhi (perfection) of the intellect is of eight kinds viz., (1) reasoning (*ūha*), (2) oral instruction (*śabda*), (3) study (adhyayana), (4—6) threefold suppression of pain (*duḥkhavighāta*)[4], (7) acquisition of friends (suhṛtprāpti) and (8) purity (*dāna*[5] i. e. attainment of discriminatory knowledge). (1), (2), (3), (7) and (8) are also called *tāratāra, sutāra, tāra, ramyaka* and *sadāmudita* respectively.[6]

The eight modes of intellect described elsewhere[7] are absorbed in this very list. Thus, we can easily include (1) under Viparyaya,

---

[1] *Sāṅkhyakārikā* 49.

[2] *Saṅkhyakārikā* 50.

[3] Cf. *Tattvakaumudī* and *Kiraṇāvalī* on Ibid.

[4] Pain or unhappiness is of three sorts according to this school (Cf. *Sāṅkhyakārikā* 1). Liberation from pain is the final aim of the school and hence these three constitute the main divisions of Perfection or power, the rest are only of secondary importance. Cf. *Tattvakaumudī* on *Sāṅkhyakārikā* 51.

[5] "दैप् शोधने" *Siddhāntakaumudī* 6.4.68; Cf. *Yogasūtra* 2.26 alongwith *Bhāṣya*.

[6] See *Tattvakaumudī* and *Kiraṇāvalī* on *Sāṅkhyakārikā* 51 for a detailed description.

[7] See p. 109.

(3), (6) and (8) under Aśakti, (4), (5) and (7) under Tuṣṭi and (2) under Siddhi.[1]

(*B*) *Pertaining to the specific objects*

Out of the three kinds of specific objects we have already dealt with the gross elements.[2] The other two are (1) the subtle or astral bodies (sūkṣmaśarīras or *liṅgas*), and, (2) the gross bodies (sthūlaśarīras) which (i. e. the latter) are produced by the parents and are perishable (anitya).[3]

The mergent[4] astral body - formed primevally,[5] uncofined,[6] lasting,[7] composed of the Buddhi and the rest down to the primary elements[3] - migrates,[9] is without enjoyment,[10] and is invested with

---

1. See *Tattvakaumudī* on *Sāṅkhyakārikā* 46.
2. The wordly objects, e.g., the jar etc. are also included in this category itself. See Section X earlier.
3. *Sāṅkhyakārikā* 39.
4. लयं गच्छतीति लिङ्गम्, हेतुमत्त्वेन चास्य लिङ्गत्वम् । *Tattvakaumudī* on *Sāṅkhyakārikā*. 40; also Cf. विद्वत्तोषिणी on ibid: व्याप्तिग्रहात् प्रधानकार्यस्य सर्वस्यापि साक्षात्परम्परया वा प्रधाने लयः ततश्च सूक्ष्मशरीरस्यापि लयो महाप्रलये भवत्येव ॥
5. प्रधानेनाऽऽदिसर्गे प्रतिपुरुषमेकैकमुत्पादितम् *Tattvakaumudī* on *Sāṅkhyakārikā* 40.
6. आ चाऽऽदिसर्गात् आ च महाप्रलयादवतिष्ठते Ibid.
7. Cf. Ibid. Its permanence is thus only relative when compared to Prakṛti or the Puruṣas.
8. The eighteen components of an astral body are Buddhi, Ahaṁkāra, the eleven indriyas and the five primary elements.
9. Cf. जननमरणकरणानां प्रतिनियमात् *Sāṅkhyakārikā* 18 wherein the migration of this body is imposed on the Puruṣa; also cf. *Sāṅkhyakārikā* 40.
10. संसरति निरुपभोगम् *Sāṅkhyakārikā* 40. This is common to all the manifested (vyakta) principles as well as to the unmanifest, because they all are equally not conscious (cetana) as the spirit (Puruṣa) is.

dispositions (bhāvas).[1] The Buddhi and the Ahaṁkāra etc. always require and, hence, have the support of the astral body. They cannot subsist without them,[2] even as a painting stands not without a ground and, as the shadow cannot subsist without a stake.[3]

The astral body, by means of its compulsory association with the intellectual products or dispositions including virtue and vice etc., determines and ensures due experience (bhoga) of the puruṣas—consequent upon their past deeds, through assuming the different gross bodies (in each individual case) of god, man, demon etc. according to the concept of migration or punarjanma in orthodox Indian tradition. This dramatic sequence and role of the astral body may be compared to those of an actor of the stage. It can assume any gross body according to requirement in any time or place due to its union with the predominant (i. e. multifarious) power of Prakṛti.[4]

The dispositions of the astral bodies are of two kinds. The first kind consists of the innate (sāṁsiddhika) ones imparted to them at the beginning of creation.[1] For example, Kapila Muni etc. were born with innate dispositions of dharma (virtue), jñāna (wisdom), vairāgya (dispassion) and aiśvarya (power). The other kind consists of the incidental (*vaikṛtika*) dharma and adharma etc. which are brought about by personal effort like the worship of a god etc. as was the case with Ṛṣi Vālmīki, for example.

---

[1] भावैरधिवासितम् *Sāṅkhyakārikā* 40; Cf. the concept of the creations or forms of a particular Buddhi like those of dharma, jñāna etc (See Sec. XI (A)).

[2] This rule does not apply to Buddhi etc. during the period before the creation of the तन्मात्रs without which there cannot be an astral body. Cf. बुद्ध्यादित्वमात्रस्य हेतुत्वे सर्गक्रमे पंचतन्मात्रोत्पत्तेः पूर्वं बुद्ध्यादिषु बुद्ध्यादित्वरूपस्य हेतोः सत्त्वात्तत्र च उक्तसाध्यस्यासत्त्वाद् व्यभिचारः स्यात् । अतो हेतौ 'प्रत्युत्पन्नपञ्चतन्मात्रवत्त्वे सति' इति विशेषणम् । तथा च तदानीं पञ्चतन्मात्रोत्पत्त्यभावेन उक्तहेतोस्तत्राभावान्न व्यभिचार इति भावः । *Suṣama* on *Sāṅkhyakārikā* 41 (quoted on p. 278 of *Sāṅkhyatattvakaumudīprabhā*.

[3] *Sāṅkhyakārikā* 41; this very migrating astral body is commonly referred to as अंगुष्ठमात्र पुरुष (Cf. महाभारत वनपर्व 296) which lies in the gross bodies. Before assuming a fresh gross body and after leaving an old one, the buddhi etc. (which are non-specific) must be accepted to inhere in the astral body (Cf. the concept of पुरि (स्थूलशरीरे) शेते इति पुरुषः in Orthodox tradition).

[4] *Sāṅkhyakārikā* 42,

The gross physical body is time and again being created or manifested through the different stages e. g. that of the aggregate formed of the uterine germ, flesh, blood etc.[2] inside the womb, and those of childhood, youth etc. after the former's emerging out of it.

Thus, in a nutshell, we have dealt with the threefold creation of the specific objects.

C *Both the above divisions of creation are necessary and complementary*

We are now in a position to appreciate the fact that without intellectual dispositions or modes (viz. dharma etc.[3]) there would be no creations of the specific objects (viz. that of the astral and gross bodies) because the former motivate and determine the details of the latter in the case of each puruṣa and similarly without the latter creations[4] there would be no development (i. e. additions, alterations etc.) due to the incidental dispositions as referred to above. Both the divisions are necessary and complementary. Hence, both the divisions of creation are justified on the ground of serving the spirits' interests.[5]

---

[1] *Sāṅkhyakārikā* 43; *Tattvakaumudī* and *Vidvattoṣiṇī* on ibid.

[2] Ibid *Kalala*, budbuda, māṁsapiṇḍa, crinze etc. are the stages of the creation or manifestation of the gross body inside the womb.

[3] Sec. XI (A).

[4] Sec. XI (B).

[5] *Sāṅkhyakārikā* 52 and *Tattvakaumudī* on ibid.

D Pertaining to the physical substances or gross elements (bhautikasarga)

The whole of the gross physical universe has been divided into three groups, viz., (1) the eight types of divine beings (devas), i. e. the Brahmās, the Prajāpatis, the Indras, the Pitṛs, the Gandharvas, the Yakṣas, the Rākṣasas, and the Piśācas; (2) the five types of lower animāls (paśus) i. e., the quadrupeds having hoofs, those hoofless and those having varying numbers of legs like the mice and the ants etc., creeping things like the snakes etc., and the immoveable ones like the tree etc.; and (3) the single type of human beings (mānavas).[1]

All these fourteen types of beings enumerated above reside in three sorts[2] of elemental creations or planes; *Sattva*, *Rajas* and *Tamas* respectively predominate in those who live on (1) the higher, (2) the middle and (3) the lower planes. The highest plane contains the following regions: Bhuvaḥ, svaḥ, mahaḥ, janaḥ, tapaḥ, and satyam. The earth having seven continents and oceans—is the middle region where the beings abound in pain and are given to actions righteous or otherwise.

Thus, we see that the divisions of creation on the gross physical level are largely in accordance with the age-old beliefs and traditions of the common men in India. The division of creation pertaining to the specific objects, except where the *tanmātras* are said to be the cause of the mahābhūtas, too, conforms to the traditions of the Purāṇa and Kāvya literature. Even the intellectual creations have not much to contribute to the already affluent stock of mythologies and theories set up in our law-books (smṛtis) and Purāṇas.

But acute analytical insight, minute observation and a systematic process of the evolution implied in the treatment of ignorance, knowledge, contentment and disability etc. in the Sāṅkhyayoga school amount to an all-time great contribution to world's philosophical literature.

---

[1] *Sāṅkhyakārikā* 53 and *Tattvakaumudī* as well as *Suṣamā* on ibid.

[2] *Sāṅkhyakārikā* 54.

XII. Conclusion

We have so far been critically evaluating the theory of creation in the Sāṅkhyayoga School in its various aspects and details. Some characteristically novel or interesting features may be noted by way of conclusion :

(a) The purpose of creation is to facilitate (1) the experiences (bhogas) of the Puruṣa in accordance with the innate as well as incidental dispositions of the intellect, and, (2) his final emergence as his own real self. The former aim is similar to those of the orthodox schools like the Nyāyavaiśeṣika, the Pūrvamīmāṁsā etc., while the latter brings it nearer to the Vedānta in some respect where, however, the soul attains liberation or his real status after direct realization of identity between the jīva and Brahman rather than after a discriminating knowledge between the Puruṣa and the Prakṛti.

(b) The intellect or the Great Principle (*Mahat Tattva*) is the first in order of manifestation or creation from the ultimate unmanifest Prakṛti. The Sāṅkhyayoga theory of creation characteristically deals more with psychological and abstruse aspect of existences than any other orthodox school of Indian Philosophy does. It is predominantly intellectual when compared to the materialistic approach of the Nyāyavaiśeṣika and the idealistic viewpoint of the Vedānta.

(c) The Parkṛti is the state of equilibrium of the three attributes which operate mutually and variously to manifest the twentythree principles (tattvas) at the beginning of creation after their harmonious process of evolution (pariṇāma) during the period of dissolution gets disturbed due to the Prakṛti's contact with the conscious being (the Puruṣa) concerned, the latter (i. e. the contact) being caused by the beginningless ajñāna. The creations or manifestations cease to operate the moment jñāna, which is another mode of Buddhi, makes the individual Puruṣa see the functions and manifestations of the Prakṛti as really different from him. The intellect and the rest consequently dissolve in the reverse order of their earlier manifestation into the ultinate unmanifest cause (i. e. the Prakṛti).

(d) The creation or manifestation of the principles is individualistic. The same creation agency viz., the Prakṛti which causes the experience of pain etc. also liberates the Puruṣa so that, thenceforth, the intellect etc. do not exist as manifest objects with regard to such beings or Puruṣas.

(e) The school postulates an indiscriminating insentient agent as active energy for creation, while the conscious being is entirely aloof, yet, contributing through the impact (bimba) of its consciousness (caitanya) on the former, to the eventual evolution (pariṇāma) of the manifest objects as well as to achieving his illusory or even unreal ends of (1) experiencing the sensations of pleasure and pain and (2) emancipation or identity with his real self so distinct and aloof from the Prakṛti and its pariṇāmas.

The mutual, and apparent, rather than real assumption of the other's characterstics between the Puruṣa and the Prakṛti has been explained by the image of the assumption of the reddishness of the *japākusuma* by the purely white *sphaṭikamaṇi* due to the proximity of the one to the other. This confusion (bhrānti) due to ignorance (avidyā) has a most vital role in order to justify the utility of the creative activity of the insentient Prakṛti. Herein we find evidence of the great imaginative genius that the Sāṅkhyayoga school employs to postulate an extremely delicate and mainly intellectual theory of creation.

(f) The concepts of the migrating astral bodies, the perishable gross bodies, the law of karman and the different kinds of the divine as well as the human and the lower beings, and the different regions (lokas) — as are familiar to every orthodox school of Indian Philosophy have been ably and eminently fitted into the overall theory of creation according to the Sāṅkhyayoga school.

(g) The theory of the cause and its effect being essentially non-different and the production or creation of the so-called effects being just manifestations or evolutions of the cause is a distinctive feature of the theory of creation in the Sāṅkhyayoga school and even helps us in establishing a single common and ultimate cause for all the effects or creations of the universe.

It vehemently contradicts the theory of causation (ārambha) as propounded in the Nyāyavaiśeṣika and appears rather similar to the approach of the Advaita Vedānta in this respect, as all objective existence is traceable to one ultimate source, but, then, the concept of the realism of all the forms or manifestations of the primeval matter as well as that of the separate identity of the souls are opposed to the latter school, and are similar to the other main orthodox schools of Indian Philosophy.

(h) At best God is only a specially qualified Puruṣa[1] useful in our spiritual advancement or *tattvajñāna* (i. e. knowledge or realization of the nature of the unknown or the reality of everything) and no importance to Him is attached in the theory of creation. He is, therefore, often, not even mentioned in the standard texts of the school, except in Yoga at the prākṛta or practical level (vyavahārabhūmi) and in the popular Indian literature like that of the Puraṇas and the Mahābhārata et cetera which are more concerned with religion and devotion than with mere knowledge[2] at the theoretical level (siddhāntabhūmi).

---

1. क्लेशकर्मविपाकाशयैरपरामृष्टः पुरुषविशेष ईश्वर : *Yogasūtra* I. 24.
2. We may note here the traditional concept of Sāṅkhya as the true knowledge. (Cf. चर्चा संख्या विचारणा *Amarakośa* 1.5.2) and that of Yoga as the Science of realization or meditation (Cf योगश्चित्तवृत्तिनिरोधः *Yogasūtra* 1.2. alongwith *Bhāṣya*).

6

THE PŪRVAMĪMĀṀSĀ

I. General Background

According to the Pūrvamīmāṁsā school of Indian Philosophy the Vedas are accepted as the only infallible source of the knowledge of dharma which consists in what has been enjoined in them as conducive to the welfare of man.[1] The ordinary means of cognition—perception, inference and the rest cannot be of much use independently.[2] The emphasis by this school on the active aspect of duty or religion of man highlights the requirements of the Pūrva (i.e. preliminary) stage before the Uttara (i. e. final) stage of the realization of ultimate knowledge (Jñāna).[3] It is, therefore, quite natural that the whole of the first chapter of the *Mīmāṁsāsūtra* is devoted to the question as to what portions of Veda directly lay down the acts to be done and those to be forbidden. The remaining eleven chapters set forth the methods of the right interpretation of the text.

---

[1] *Mīmāṁsāsūtra* 2.

[2] Ibid 4; *Tantravārttika* (Benaras Sanskrit Series edition) p. 50.

[3] *Pūrvamīmāṁsā in its Sources*, by Mahāmahopādhyāya Dr. Sir G. N Jha (B. H. U., 1964) p. 7.

It is clear from what has been said above that, although, the Vedic texts, whose interpretation forms the main topic for the consideration of this school, do contain several theories of creation, the Pūrvamīmāṁsā concerns itself purposively with the active (or karma) aspects of dharma[1] consisting of sacrificial rites,[2] rather than knowledge of any metaphysical theories including those of creation.

It is due to its non-metaphysical approach that Dr. Jha rightly observes : "Mīmāṁsā proper has never claimed to be a 'Darśana', a system of Philosophy. In fact, so far as the *Sūtra* is concemed it does not take into cognizance any philosophical topic except that of Pramāṇas, Perception and the rest. The commentators have introduced such topics as the 'Soul' and the 'Apūrva', but only as corollary to its main theme of 'Dharma', Duty of Man; if there is no Soul and no Apūrva, there can be no point in performing Dharma, one'ṣ Duty; hence these have been set forth by the later exponents; the soul has been specially emphasized; but regarding any detailed investigation and consideration of this Soul, the older writers have deliberately referred the enquirer to the 'Vedānta'. Says Kumārila at the end of his Ātmavāda, in the *Ślokavārttika*: *ityāha nāstikyanirākariṣṇurātmāstitāṁ*

---

[1] 'It will be seen that for Jaimini—in fact for all Indian Philosophers,—the connotation of the term 'Dharma' is very much wider than that of 'Religion'; it stands for the whole duty of Man, the performance of which is conducive to his welfare— here, in this world, during present life—, as also elsewhere, after death'. *Pūrvamīmāṁsā in its Sources*, p. 8.

[2] Ibid p. 8; Ibid p. 316.

prati bhāṣyakṛdatra yuktyā dṛḍhatvametadviṣayaḥ prabodhaḥ prayāti Vedāntaniṣevaṇena."[1]

The two systems of the Pūrvamīmāṁsā and the Vedānta are complementary to each other or rather represent the two aspects of one and the same goal.[2] This contention is supported by the significant terms Pūrvamīmāṁsā (i. e. preliminary discourse) and Uttaramīmāṁsā (i. e. final discourse) traditionally applied to them. Thus, the teacher of the uttara school may equally pass for that of the pūrva as well.[3] In fact the study of the uttara school necessitates that of the pūrva[4] and Bādarāyaṇa too, does, not explicitly deny the authenticity of the Pūrvamīmāṁsā theories.[5]

II. No Universal Creation and Dissolution

There is no basis for the assumption that there is a creation and evolution of the world, consisting in the birth and destruction of all things.[6] In fact the very concept of causality involving the separate identity or distinctive nature of cause and effect is implied to be based only on worldly usage or common reasoning.[1] This shows that they believe in satkāryavāda.[2]

---

[1] *Pūrvamīmāṁsā in its Sources*, p. 4.

[2] Ibid. pp. 5-7.

[3] In support of purely Mīmāṁsā topics Jaimini quotes Bādarāyaṇa the author of *Uttaramīmāṁsā* with great reverence and is in agreement with his views. Cf *Mīmāṁsāsūtra* 1.1.5; 5.2.19; 6.1.8; 10.8 44; and 11.1.64.

[4] Cf. *Śāṁkarabhāṣya* on *Vedāntasūtra* 4.1.8. Hence the Vedāntin's oft-quoted statement व्यवहारे तु भाट्टनया See for examples of Mīmāṁsā Nyāyas or sayings adopted by the Vedāntins Chapter 33 of *Pūrvamīmāṁsā in its Sources.*

[5] Both Jaimini (Cf. *Mīmāṁsā Sūtra* 1.1.5) and Bādarāyaṇa (Cf. *Brahma Sūtra* 3.2.40) refer to each other. It is interesting to note that the latter does not question the views of the Pūrvamīmāṁsā while refuting the various theories of creation opposed to him, and that the *Jaiminisūtra* too does not criticize any of the views of the Vedānta.

[6] *Ślokavārttika* (सम्बन्धाक्षेपपरिहार) 113. But, we find that Kumārila also accepts

The Mīmāṁsaka is a staunch opponent of any theory of dissolution without which the traditional theory of creation having a beginning as well as an end at certain points of time is rendered ludicrous or even impossible. Thus, it is maintained that the entire world of composite things down to the *dvyaṇuka* according to the atomic process cannot become dissolved simultaneously as such a fact is beyond our common experience according to which we find that while one thing is coming into existence another is disappearing.[3] This constant creation and dissolution of the things of the world makes the Mīmāṁsaka's oft-

---

both creation and dissolution cf the universe and, thus, contradicts himself on this well known concept of *Pūrvamīmāṁsā* मन्त्रार्थवादेतिहासप्रामाण्यात्सृष्टिप्रलयाविष्येते तत्र सृष्ट्यादौ प्रजापतिरेव योगी तस्मिन्काले पुण्यकर्मोद्भवाभ्युपगमेन पशूनामभावात्स्वमाहात्म्येनात्मन एव पशुरूपमभिनिर्माय वपोत्खननादि कृतवांस्ततोऽसमाप्त एव कर्मणि त्वपरः पशुरुत्थितः इतीदृशमिदं कर्म प्रत्यासन्नफलम् । एवं च महता यत्नेन प्रजापतिना चरितमिति सर्वं सत्यमेव । प्रतिसृष्टि चतुर्लिंगन्यायेन तुल्यनामप्रभावव्यापारवस्तूत्पत्तेर्नानित्यताप्रसंग इति । p. 28 of *Tantravārttika* (Pub. by Messers Braj B. Das & Co. Benares Sanskrit Series No. 5, 1882). Thus, we may conclude that they often dney the beginning or dissolution of the universe due to an apparent lack of interest in it only. That the common world of things really was and shall be as it is, is their chief import in such sweeping remarks against the established orthodox views on creation. In other words they are too concerned with the present duties of man and the practical role of wordly things therein to imagine a pre-phenomenal stage of reality.

1. *Bṛhatī* (and *Ṛjuvimalāpañcikā* on it), p. 83 (Madras University Edition).
2. Critical Bibliography (*Mīmāṁsākusumāñjali*) p. 29, by Mahāmahopādhyāya Dr Umesha Mishra (Published by Benares Hindu University).
3. कथमेकदैव सर्वेऽवयविनो विलीयन्त इति समधिगमनीयम् । अधुनेव किमिति कस्यचिदुदयः कस्यचिद्विलय इति नाङ्गीक्रियते दृष्टानुगमादिति मन्यामहे । *Ṛjuvimalāpañcikā* p. 191 (*Bṛhatī*, University of Madras Edition).

quoted saying '*na kadācidanīdṛśañjagat*'—"i. e. the world was, is or will be never 'not-like this' " intelligible to us and signifies the complete unlikelihood of the universe as a whole ever being created or dissolved according to the Pūrvamīmāṁsā school.

We know that the earliest literature of Pūrvamīmāṁsā viz., that of the *Mīmāṁsāsūtra* does not at all talk about creation. But, the commentators like Prabhākaramiśra and Kumārilabhaṭṭa have dealt with the problem of creation as we have noted earlier. The later Mīmāṁsakas or neo-mīmāṁsists have expressed their willingness to accept God as the creator of the universe as well as the existence of creation and dissolution of the universe.[1]

III. The Process of the Creation of the Non-eternal Realities and the Role of Unseen Force therein

However, indivdual composite wholes or aggregates of the four substances[2] viz. earth, water, fire and air like the jar, the piece of cloth etc. have admittedly always continued to be created and dissolved according to the atomic process[3] and are pereptible due to their large dimension made possible by not less than three constituent particles or parts.[4]

The Pūrvamīmāṁsā does not object and, therefore, implyingly approves of the Nyāyavaiśeṣika theory of creation so far as the role of adṛṣṭa (or apūrva) and that of the atoms[1] are concerned. Thus, it is said that all the worldly things including the bodies and the various regions (lokas) etc. are composite in their nature and come into existence through the conjunction (saṁyoga) of their constituent parts right from the coming together of the two atoms which is brought about by their vibration or motion due to the conjunctions of the souls influenced by the Unseen Force (adṛṣṭa or destiny) consisting of merit and demerit (dharma and adharma).[2] The action of the destiny is no other than its coming into existence and this is brought about or produced by such acts as sacrificing and the like.[3]

---

[1] *Mīmāṁsābhyudaya* (Kumbakonam, 1925) by D. T. Tātācāryaśiromaṇi, pp. 115-122; *Sarvasiddhāntasaṁgraha* 8 40-41; A commentary on *ṣaḍdarśanasamuccaya* attributes to Jaimini the doctrine of māyā (See p. 76 of *The Karma Mīmāṁsā* by A. B. Keith (Heritage of India series, Calcutta, 1921).

[2] *Prakaraṇapañcikā* (B. H. U. Darśana Series Edition, 1961) pp. 83-84.

[3] Ibid, p. 306.

[4] See the Prābhākara view set forth on pp. 56-57 of *Pūrvamīmāṁsā in its Sources.*

The Pūrvamīmāṁsā deals predominantly with the subject of karmans or acts of the souls which result in merit and demerit.[4] The production or creation or even non-production during the liberated state, of the bodies is dependent on the individual soul's merit and demerit.[5] It is only for the experiencing of the reactions of the past karman (i. e. adṛṣṭa or apūrva due to both dharma and adharma) that the soul is born in or burdened with the physical body.[6]

Body (i. e. the *bhogāyatana*) is created or made up of earth only. It is only of three kinds —(1) womb-born (*jarāyuja*) e. g. the human beings and the animals; (2) egg-born (*aṇḍaja*) e. g. the birds, the snakes etc.; and (3) sweat-born (*svedaja*) e. g. the louses, the bugs etc. The traditional fourth type of vegetable (i. e. the vanaspati or *udbhij*) body is not admitted, as we have no proof for the existence of the

---

1. *Pūrvamīmāṁsā in its Sources*, p. 68 (lines 20-36).
2. *Ṛjuvimalāpañcikā*, pp. 190-191.
3. आत्मलाभश्चादृष्टस्य यागाद्यनुष्ठानसिद्ध एव इति Ibid, p. 191; *Pūrvamīmāṁsā in its Sources*, p. 316.
4. *Prakaraṇapañcikā* p. 156 referred to in *Pūrvamīmāṁsā in its Sources*, p. 31.
5. *Ślokavārttika* (सम्बन्धाक्षेपपरिहार) 108-110; Cf. *Nyāyaratnākara* and *Kāśikā* on Ibid (आत्मवाद) 106.
6. *Ślokavārttika*. (सम्ब्रन्धाक्षेपपरिहार) 108-110.

sense-organs in this case. The mind and the tactile organ[1] are present in all these bodies.

Particular cognitions (jñānas) which are always found to be transitory[2], are possible because of the contact of the two substances viz., the mind and the soul, resulting from merit and demerit attaching to the soul. These contacts are produced or created by a certain action of the mind, again, caused either by the efforts of the embodied soul or by the unseen forces[3] which latter are the effects of previous mind-soul contacts; and so the infinite cycle goes on.[4] However, in addition to the mind-soul contact, the particular action of the concerned sense-organs (i. e., the visual etc.) is also necessary[5] for the production of cognition; otherwise, a blind man might also be reasonably capable of perceiving colour, which is not a fact. In other words, sense-organs are the instruments of cognition while the mind-soul contact is the common[6] cause of the production (or creation) of all cognitions or experiences including those of the inner objects i. e. pleasure, pain etc. as well as those pertaining to the outer objects i. e. the jar and the tree etc.[7] These experiences (i. e. the bhogas) take place or are produced only in the physical body (i. e. the *bhogāy-*

---

[1] Elsewhere we find the details of all the five sense-organs viz., the olfactory, the gestatory, the visual, the tactile and the auditory. Cf. *Ślokavārttika* (प्रत्यक्ष) 51 and *Nyāyaratnākara* on it.

[2] *Ṛjuvimalāpañcikā* p. 191.

[3] i. e. due to the endless series of merit and demerit, the accumulated effects of past acts of the individual concerned. Cf. *Prābhākara School of Pūrvamīmāṁsā* (1911) by Dr. G. N Jha, pp. 77-78.

[4] *Prakaraṇapañcikā* pp. 150-151.

[5] *Pūrvamīmāṁsā in its Sources*, p. 83.

[6] Ibid.

[7] Ibid, p. 232 (referred to on p. 26 of *Pūrvamīmāṁsā in its Sources*).

atana) which acts as their common abode or receptacle[1], whose production we have already discussed in the preceding para.

In this theory of creation, motion or action (karman) is the passing of a thing through certain conjunctions and disjunctions with points in space (i. e. dik). It comes into existence and is dissolved as is perceived[2] by us in common experience.[3]

The objects of the world (padārathas) have not been systematically mentioned in the well-known treatises of the Pūrvamīmāṁsā.[4] A short account of the non-eternal objects as is available with us, however, may not be found out of place in our general understanding of the theory of creation according to this school. Four categories of such things have been accepted, viz., those of substance (dravya), quality (guṇa), action (karman) and constituent part[5] (avayava). Inherence[6] (*samavāya*) is actually found to be ephemeral. For instance, the inherence between the community (*jāti*) and the individual (*vyakti*) comes into existence when the vyakti is produced and it perishes as soon as that individual perishes.[7] Similarity (sādṛśya) is acccpted as a category of reality because it enters into our consciousness exactly in the same manner as any other category.[8] Particularity (*viśeṣa*) is, in fact, only the quality of separateness (pṛthaktva) which differentiates the ultimate substances in the shape of atoms.[9] Darkness (*tamas*) is not a distinct substance.[10]

---

[1] See ft. n. 7 on p. 125 earlier.

[2] According to some it is inferred. Cf. *Pūrvamīmāṁsā in its Sources*, pp. 78-79.

[3] *Śāstradīpikā*, p. 50 (referred to in Ibid, p. 58).

[4] See *Pūrvamīmāṁsā in its Sonrces* Ch. VII (Introductory lines).

[5] *Śābarabhāṣya* on *Mīmāṁsāsūtra* 10.3.44.

[6] *Ślokavārttika* on 1.1.4 (प्रत्यक्ष) 146-150.

[7] *Prakaraṇapañcikā*, pp. 90-93.

[8] Ibid, pp. 268-69.

[9] Ibid, p. 268.

[10] *Prakaraṇapañcikā* pp. 322-323, Rāmānujācārya's *Tantrarahasya* p. 21 (referred

IV. The Uncreated Eternal Realities

The uncreated eternal realities are of two kinds viz., (1) the ubiquitous ones consisting of the souls, time, space and word or sound as well as (2) the atomic ones consisting of the atoms of earth, water fire and air and also the minds. That the atoms and the mind have movement in different points of time and space and contribute to creation on the physical and psychic planes respectively, and that the individual souls are both the experiencer and the main beneficiary of creation as well as the actor or doer of acts which result in the all-important and binding production or operation (consisting of its coming into existence in all cases) of the unseen force or destiny—is evident from what we have already said above. We do not require to go into other aspects or details of these realities in our present context.

V. Śakti As the Causal Energy

According to this school every thing in this world, whether eternal or non-eternal, possesses a potency, power or capacity (śakti) which can be inferred from the fact of its (i. e. the thing's) bringing about or producing a certain effect. For example, the visible form of fire remains unchanged while it burns; this leads us to the conclusion that there is something in fire by virtue of which it can burn and in the abscence of which it would not burn.[1] This factor enabling a thing to produce its effects is imperceptible and known as śakti. It is eternal in eternal things, and subsists transitorily in transitory or non-eternal things together with which it is both created and dissolved.

In this way, although, the Mīmāṁsakas do not accept the theory of causation (*ārambha*) they account for the phenomenon of production

---

to on p. 245 of *Bhāratīya Darśana* by Mm. Dr. Umesha Mishra.

[1] *Prakaraṇapañcikā*, pp. 218-219.

or creation in each case by postulating a potency or causal energy, so to say, native to all things in the universe. Thus, it may be asserted that the unseen force, the atoms, the souls and the minds etc. are able to participate in the process of creation due to an innate śakti in them.

VI. The Non-being and Creation

Non-apprehension or non-cognition is the sixth means of cogniton through which the non-being or non-existence (abhāva) of things becomes cognised or known.[1]

This non-being which is a real entity[2] (vastu) is of four kinds : (1) previous non-being, (2) non-being by destruction, (3) mutual non-being, and (4) absolute non-being as found, for example, in that of curd in the milk, in that of milk in curd, in that of cloth in the jar, and in that of horns in the ass respectively.

The nos. (1) and (2) are relevant to the theory of creation in the Pūrvamīmāṁsā as the transitory things constantly come into existence and cease to exist or get destructed. The role of non-being here is similar to that of the Nyāyavaiśeṣika theory of creation.

VII. God and Creation

Orthodox Indians in general and the Nyāyavaiśeṣika in particular, for example, believe that the unseen force is non-intelligent or unconscious by its very nature, and that, as a matter of fact, no unintelligent entity is found to act except under the guidance of an intelligent operator. The souls cannot cognise or know the unseen force which consists of their own merit and demerit and under whose influence they constantly remain, and, as such they are unfit to supervise, ope-

---

1. *Ślokavārttika* (अभाव) 1-2.
2. Ibid, 2-9.

rate or guide it. Hence, a giant controller or supervisor of super-intelligence (viz., God)[1] should be postulated.

The Pūrvamīmāṁsā strongly attacks the above view and contends that no such supervisor or God is required to operate in the process of creation,[2] and, that the above concept of God is too flimsy to receive any serious consideration.[3]

The following grounds have been adduced by the various exponents of this school for rejecting the postulation of God as a creator :

(a) The Pūrvamīmāṁsā believes in the eternality of word (or sound), its meaning and the relationship between these two, hence, the postulation of God as setting up the entire verbal convention or process is rejected outright.[4] The doctrine of the self-sufficiency of the Veda presupposes its being independent of all personal (or creative) agency.[5]

(b) Dharma and adharma (e. g., those of the men and the animals) belong to the bodies of the individual souls, and, hence,

---

1. It may be noted that arguments have been adduced to disprove the possibility of there being any omniscient person. Cf. Ślokavārttika on *Mīmāṁsāsūtra* 1.1.2, verses 117-151.
2. If the conscious souls are unable to control their destiny by reason of their being non cognizant of it how can an entirely different intelligent being (i. e. the Super-soul or God) be its controller ? Cf. *Ṛjuvimalāpañcikā* pp. 190-191; Also some things, e. g., the bodies of men and animals, are brought into existence by the operation of their parents and not by any external supervising agency. Cf. *Prakaraṇapañcikā* p. 306 et seq.
3. *Ṛjuvimalāpañcikā*, pp. 190-191.
4. *Ślokavārttika* (सम्बन्धाक्षेपपरिहार) 41 et seq; *Mīmāṁsāsūtra*, 1.1.5; *Bṛhatī*, p. 174 et. seq.; *Prakaraṇapañcikā* p. 230 et. seq.
5. *Prakaraṇapañcikā*, p. 301 et. seq.; *Śābara Bhāṣya* on *Mīmāṁsā Sūtra* 1.1.27 et. seq.

the ultra-mundane God, howsoever intelligent, cannot have their knowledge in the absence of which no effective control of them is possible.[1]

(c) The supervision exercised by God cannot be of the nature of contact with Him because dharma and adharma are qualities and contact (saṁyoga) is possible between or among substances alone. Nor can the supervision be of the nature of inherence because they already inhere in the other souls and as such cannot inhere in God also. There is no other type of relationship that could be said to exist between God and destiny.[2]

(d) Supervision is performed through contact of the ordinary agents (e. g. that of the carpenter etc.) with the tools and instruments as well as with the materials (e. g. the wooden pieces in the above case) on which the man works. But, the instruments of creation viz. dharma and adharma, likewise, cannot have contact with any operation of things, as they are qualities.[3]

(e) Soul (or an intelligent being like man for that matter) is, in fact, found capable of supervision over that body alone which he ensouls due to his dharma-adharma, but, the atoms cannot be said to be such a body of God and, hence, He cannot supervise the operation or action of the atoms.[4]

(f) God must make an effort like the soul in his supervisory role of the body, to move the atoms even if they are taken as consituting His body for the sake of argument. Then, the atoms being eternal the creative process or activity would also be similar. Hence, no

---

1. *Prakaraṇapañcikā*, p. 306 et seq.
2. Ibid.
3. Ibid
4. Ibid.

dissolution or period without creation is possible and also God would obviously be ineffective in controlling it.[1]

(g) The analogy of the creation of the jar by the potter, extended further, would require God also to be a corporeal being. But we know that no corporeal being can excercise any effective control over such subtle things as atoms, dharma and adharma all of which have definite roles to play in the creation of body itself.[2]

(h) Then, God Himself as a corporeal being would have to be supposed as the creation of another supervisor or creator and so on and on *ad infinitum.*[3]

(i) The action bringing about the creation of the universe cannot be held to be in the atoms operating under the will of God. The mere wish of a conscious being is never known to move or cause action in inert things in our common experience.[4]

(j) The knowledge of pre-phenomenal or pre-creation stage or that pertaining to the period of dissolution—as to the form in which the creator existed or the conditions in which the things of the world remained then—is not possible to be determined as none of us in the present times have witnessed the beginning of creation.[5]

(k) It is a matter of common experience that desire arises only in the embodied or corporeal intelligent beings, but at the beginning of creation earth etc. would not be there to make up the body of God in whom the desire to create (*sisṛkṣā*) is said to arise.[6]

---

[1] *Prakaraṇapañcikā*, p. 306 et seq.

[2] Ibid.

[3] Ibid.

[4] *Ślokavārttika* (सम्बन्धाक्षेपपरिहार), 82.

[5] Ibid, 41 et seq.

[6] Ibid, 47.

(l) At the beginning of creation there must have been no material to work upon and implements to work with, as are known to us in common experience.[1]

(m) The all-powerful God must have a purpose for his activity of creation and this cannot be compassion because, then, the world would be made entirely happy which is not the case, pain and suffering abound in the world.[2]

(n) No sane person undertakes activity without a purpose and God could not be an intelligent person if he is held to create without any self-interest or motive.[3]

(o) He cannot be said to create out of a desire for sport (*līla*) because He is *āptakāma* (i. e. one whose desires have been or always remain fulfilled) or at least would be too much busy in carrying out all the operations necessary to create and carry on the world to be happy over it and regard it as a sport.[4]

(p) The mere assertion by the Creator Himself about His desire to multiply as found in the Upaniṣadic texts, is not enough to bring conviction to us or, for that matter, to the worldly people.[5]

(q) If the world's creation were a process dependent on the whim of the creator there would be no reasonable basis for the popular doctrine of Karman or destiny (based on fair-play) which, itself, if believed to function, could very well be regarded responsible for bringing about the things of the world. In other words, the karman of the living beings is a responsible factor or agency (if such a one must needs be postulated) for creation.[6]

---

1. *Ślokavārttika* (सम्वन्धाक्षेपपरिहार), 50, 51.
2. Ibid. 52.
3. Ibid. 55.
4. Ibid. 56.
5. Ibid, 60.
6. Ibid, 72-75.

(r) If the bodies of men etc. are held to have been created by God merely because they are bodies, the same would apply to God also and His body would require another creator. On the other hand, He as the creator cannot be without a body on the analogy of the potter creating the jar, and, also, due to the common experience that, only the corporeal beings are able to make an effort without which no activity is possible.[1]

(s) God cannot also be the Vedāntic Supreme-Self existing alone before the beginning of creation Who by His own wish evolves out of Himself the earth, water and other things, because, the all-pure Supreme-Self cannot justifiably evolve out of Himself things opposite in nature[2] (i. e. those that are impure). The experiences of the impurities like pain and suffering cannot proceed from illusion which can neither be justified to inhere in the Supreme-Self nor be due to some other cause in which case, the theory of 'one cause' becomes abandoned.[3]

A prominent sub-school of the Pūrvamīmāṁsā (viz. that of Kumārila), however, has been felt to believe in the existence of one eternal Super-soul (Paramātman) identical with and present in all the souls i. e. the conscious or intelligent beings (jīvātmans).[4] This is the teaching of the Vedānta also and the *Ślokavārttika* ends its treatise on soul with the declaration that the sound knowledge of soul (or ātman) is to be obtained from the Vedānta.[5] It

---

1. *Ślokavārttika*, (सम्बन्धाक्षेपपरिहार) 77-79.
2. *Pūrvamīmāṁsā* believes in Satkāryavāda. See *Critical Bibliography* (or *Mīmāṁsānukramaṇī*) by Dr. U. Mishra, p. 29.
3. *Ślokavārttika* (सम्बन्धाक्षेपपरिहार) 82-86; For the refutation of thə Sāṅkhya theory of creation according to the viewpoint of this school, see ibid, 87-101.
4. *Sarvasiddhāntasaṁgraha* by Śaṁkarācārya (Ch. VIII on भट्टाचार्य पक्ष) Verses 10, 36 and 38. (Madras, 1909 ed. by Raṅgācārya).
5. इत्याह नास्तिक्यनिराकरिष्णुरात्मास्तितां भाष्यकृदत्र युक्त्या । दृढत्वमेतद्विषयश्च बोधः प्रयाति वेदान्तनिषेवणेन ॥ *Ślokavārttika* (आत्मवाद) 148.

appears[1] that Kumārila was a believer in Paramātman or Brahman or even ātman as typically known in orthodox Indian tradition for that matter in its impersonal aspect, though he was opposed to the idea of a Personal World Creator (as seen above).

However, we may by-pass or overlook this confusion in the words of the great modern Mīmāṁsaka Dr. Gaṅgānātha Jhā that "if he had really believed in the Super-soul, it seems impossible that he should not have asserted that belief and should have left it to be inferred from his reference to the Vedānta, which, too, does not necessarily[2] indicate his belief in the Super-soul."[3]

We may, therefore, conclude that the school not only does not believe in God, but, is also strongly opposed to the possibility of His being the Giant Superintendent of the process of creation.

VIII. Conclusion

We may, now, briefly point out some of the most distinguishing characteristics of the theory of creation according to the pūrvamīmāṁsā school :

(a) The Supervision of the work of creation being impossible, it has to be regarded as a never-ending process of the things coming into existence (or being created) and passing out of it or being

---

1. Cf. प्रायेणैव हि मीमांसा लोके लोकायतीकृता । तामास्तिकपथे कर्तुमयं यत्नः कृतो मया ॥ *Ślokavārttika* (intro. verses) 10.
2. Even Prabhākara, however, is not against the existence of God. Cf. 'एवं चानुमानिकत्वमेव ईश्वरस्य निराकृतं नेश्वरोऽपि निराकृतः । अत एव न प्रभाकरगुरुभिः ईश्वरनिरासः कृतः । तत्समर्थनं च वेदान्तमीमांसायां क्रियते इत्यभिप्रेतम् । अत एवाहुः आत्मवादान्ते मृदितकषायाणामेव एतत् कथनीयं, न कर्मसङ्गिनाम्' इति सर्वमुपपन्नम् । *Prabhākaravijaya* pp. 76-83. *Mīmāṁsākośaḥ* ed. by Kevalānanda Saraswatī (प्रज्ञा पाठशाला मण्डल ग्रन्थमाला, 1953, Satara, Vol. II p. 1080).
3. *Pūrvamīmāṁsā in its Sources*, p. 46.

destroyed under the influence of the dharma-adharma (i. e. the unseen force or destiny) of the souls ensouling these things, and, there is no reason for the assumption of an Ultra-Cosmic 'God-creator'.[1]

(b) The universe is made up of constituent parts which, individually have their beginnings one after the other as well as also cease to exist one after the other. In fact, this view is supported by our actual everyday experience.

(c) The Mīmāṁsaka lays stress upon the reality of the external world, because if cognition had no real basis or reality in the things of the external universe itself, all that has been declared in the Veda with regard to the worldly and supernatural results following from actions would be rendered meaningless or without purpose to the common man[2].

(d) The world of actions and their fruits is too much with the Pūrvamīmāṁsā to allow it to analyze the realities of the world minutely and formulate an independent or viable theory of creation in comparision with those of the other orthodox schools of Indian Philosophy. *In fact, its theory of creation is a roughly modified version of that of the Nyāyavaiśeṣika to suit its own requirements.*

(e) Paramount faith in the infallibility, supremacy and self-sufficiency of the Veda indirectly and that in the acts enjoined by it directly, greatly mould the non-theistic as well as the realistic nature of its theory of creation.

---

1. *Prakaraṇapañcikā*, p. 306 et seq.
2. *Ślokavārttika* (निरालम्बनवाद), 3-15.

7

THE VEDĀNTA

I. Introduction

The Vedānta bases all its theories on the evidence of the Upaniṣadic statements[1] (representing the śrutiprasthāna) and as such also the *Brahmasūtra* of Bādarāyaṇa (representing the nyāyaprasthāna) as well as the *Bhagavadgītā* (representing the smṛtiprasthāna) have been the constant source of interest and hence even difference of interpretation, to several orthodox Indian Philosophers.[2] The Vedānta

---

[1] वेदान्तो नामोपनिषत्प्रमाणं तदुपकारीणि शारीरकसूत्रादीनि । *Vedāntasāra*; वेदान्तवाक्यकुसुमग्रथनार्थत्वात्सूत्राणाम् । वेदान्तवाक्यानि सूत्रैरुदाहृत्य विचार्यन्ते । *Brahmasūtraśāṁkarabhāṣya* 1.1.2.

[2] The following commentaries are well-known : (1) *Śāṁkarabhāṣya* (788-820); (2) *Bhāskarabhāṣya* (9th Cen. A. D.); (3) *Rāmānujabhāṣya* (12th Cen. A. D.); (4) *Nimbārkabhāṣya* (13th Cen. A. D.); (5) *Mādhvabhāṣya* (13th Cen. A. D.); (6) *Vāllabhabhāṣya* (1479-1544 A. D.); (7) *Śrīkaṇṭhabhāṣya* (13th Cen. A D.); (8) *Śrīkarabhāṣya* (14th Cen. A.D.); (9) *Vijñānabhikṣubhāṣya* (16th Cen. A.D.); (10) *Baladevabhāṣya* (18th Cen. A.D); and (11) *Śaktibhāṣya* (20th Cen. A.D.).

(especially that of Śaṅkara) has a very large literature and has been the most widely studied and professedly[1] followed orthodox school of Indian Philosophy even in the modern times. We propose, however, to deal with the salient features of the theory of creation as put forth by its following six eminent exponents (ācāryas) only for the sake of convenience.

II. The Śāṅkara School

(*A*) *The unqualified reality alone is the origin of creation*

According to Śaṅkara the beginningless indefinable and undifferentiated principle called avidyā, which is at the root of all creation is dependent on the one attributeless unconditioned ultimate reality (Brahman)[2]. The avidyā in the pre-phenomenal or pre-creation stage subsists as energy or potency (śakti) of Brahman and is known as unmanifest power (māyā) as the created universe of names and forms has not come into existence[3]. Due to this very śakti Brahman having eternally pure existence[4] is called sarvaśaktimān[5], parameśvara[6]

---

1. Cf. the saying कलौ वेदान्तिनः सर्वे prevalent in the Indian tradition.
2. सदेव सोम्येदमग्र आसीदेकमेवाद्वितीयम् *Chāndogyopaniṣad* 6.2.1; अशब्दमस्पर्शमरूपम् *Kaṭhopaniṣad* 1.3.15; निष्कलं निष्क्रियं शान्तम् *Śvetāśvataropaniṣad* 6.19.
3. अविद्यात्मिका हि बीजशक्तिरव्यक्तशब्दनिर्देश्या परमेश्वराश्रया मायामयी महासुषुप्तिः *Śāṅkarabhāṣya* 1.4.3; सतां विद्यमानानां स्वेन अविद्याकृतनामरूपमायास्वरूपेण सर्वभावानां विश्वतैजसप्राज्ञभेदानामुत्पत्तिः *Māṇḍūkyabhāṣya* 1.6.
4. अस्ति तावद्ब्रह्म नित्यशुद्धबुद्धमुक्तस्वभावं सर्वज्ञं सर्वशक्तिसमन्वितं ब्रह्मशब्दस्य व्युत्पाद्यमानस्य नित्यशुद्धत्वादयोऽर्थाः प्रतीयन्ते बृहतेर्धातोरर्थानुगमात् *Śāṅkarabhāṣya* 1.1.1.
5. परिपूर्णशक्तिकं तु ब्रह्म। *Śāṅkarabhāṣya* 2.1.24; सर्वशक्तियुक्ता च परा देवतेत्यभ्युपगन्तव्यम् Ibid, 2.1.30; प्रतिषिद्धसर्वविशेषस्य ब्रह्मणः सर्वशक्तियोगः सम्भवति Ibid, 2.1.31.
6. आत्मेत्येव परमेश्वरः प्रतिपत्तव्यः। *Śāṅkarabhāṣya* 4.1.3; अविक्रियस्य च व्योमवत् सर्वगतस्य अमूर्तस्य आत्मनः केनचित् संयोगानुपपत्तेः सिद्धं क्षेत्रज्ञस्य नित्यमेवेश्वरत्वम् *Gītābhāṣya* 13.2; परमेश्वरस्य सिद्धं निर्विशेषत्वमेकत्वञ्च Ibid, 13.27; एवम्भूतमपि परमेश्वरं नित्यशुद्धबुद्धमुक्त-

and *māyin*[1]. These apparent[2] denotations or descriptions, however, do not contradict or modify the attributelessness of Brahman (i. e. the unqualified or pure reality)[3].

This unqualified Parabrahman is also the material cause of the universe in as much as nothing else is the absolute or true reality in his opinion[4]. Śaṅkara interprets the different passages of the Upaniṣads in order to illustrate his contention that Parabrahman is the sole reality or material cause (upādāna) of the universe[5]. The same Brahman is also the efficient cause of all creation[6]. The assignment of desiring to become many and to procreate to the ultimate reality proves that Parabrahman alone is the efficient cause as the willing intelligent agent and the material cause as the one reality getting transformed into several entities in the process of creation[7]. The Upaniṣads expressly state that all the elements are created from and also dissolve into the one and the same principle. That that from which some other thing springs, and into which (i. e. the former) it returns, is the material cause of that other (i. e.

स्वभावं सर्वभूतात्मानं निर्गुणं संसारदोषप्रदाहकारणं मां नाभिजानाति Ibid, 7.12; तद्विपरीतमपहृतपाप्मत्वादिगुणकं पारमेश्वरं स्वरूपम् विद्यया प्रतिपद्यते सर्पादिविलयनेनैव रज्ज्वादीन् *Śāṅkarabhāṣya* 1.3.19; प्रतिषिध्यत एव तु परमार्थतः सर्वज्ञात् परमेश्वरादन्यो द्रष्टा श्रोता वा नान्योऽतोऽस्ति द्रष्टा श्रोता इत्यादिना Ibid 3.1.17.

[1] प्रकृतिं तु मायां विद्यान्मायिनं तु महेश्वरम् । *Śvetāśvataropaniṣad* 4.10.

[2] वाचोऽभिधानानि द्रव्यादिसविकल्पवस्तुविषयाणि वस्तुसामान्यान्निर्विकल्पेऽद्वयेऽपि ब्रह्मणि प्रयोक्तृभिः प्रकाशनाय प्रयुज्यमानान्यप्राप्याप्रकाश्यैव निवर्तन्ते स्वसामर्थ्याद् हीयन्ते *Taittirīyabhāṣya* 2.9; Cf. *Kenopaniṣad* 1.4.

[3] अनिरुक्तेऽनिलयने *Taittirīya Upaniṣad* 2.7.1; इति चावाच्यत्वं नीलोत्पलवदवाक्यार्थत्वं च ब्रह्मणः *Taittirīyabhāṣya* 2.1.

[4] प्रकृतिश्चोपादानकारणत्वं च ब्रह्माभ्युपगन्तव्यम् *Śāṅkarabhāṣya* 1.4.23.

[5] एवं यथासम्भवं प्रतिवेदान्तं प्रतिज्ञादृष्टान्तौ प्रकृतित्वसाधनौ प्रत्येतव्यौ Ibid.

[6] तस्मादधिष्ठानान्तराभावादात्मनः कर्तृत्वमुपादानान्तराभावाच्च प्रकृतित्वम् Ibid.

[7] Ibid, 1.4.24.

the latter) thing is a well known fact, e. g., the earth or clay is the material cause of rice, barley etc.[1] Thus, the Brahman is spoken of as acting on itself as the material[2] and is exalted as the maker, the Lord, the person who has the source in Brahman[3], and that which the wise regard as the origin of all beings[4]. Reality is described as both that (*tyat*) pure existence (i. e. Brahman) as well as this (*sat*) appearance as many (as found in the universe) or, in other words, as the undifferentiated or unmanifest as well as the differentiated or manifest[5].

All the states or conditions of creation or appearance originate from the attributeless Brahman alone and the final cause can be neither māyā nor the qualified Brahman[6] or soul[7]. This is the fundamental concept of Vedānta according to this school[1]. The ultimate reality alone[2] is the cause of the universe as expressed in the scriptures and the arguments in conformity with them[3]. That omniscient[4] omnipotent cause from which proceed the origin and the subsistence[5] and the dissolution of this world – which is differentiated by names and forms, contains many agents and enjoyers[6], and is the abode of the deeds and their results in particular places and times, and the nature of whose arrangement cannot even be considered by the mind – is Brahman[7].

---

[1] *Śāṅkarabhāṣya* 1.4.25; Cf. सर्वाणि ह वा इमानि भूतानि आकाशादेव सपुत्पद्यन्ते आकाशं प्रत्यस्तं यन्ति *Chāndogyopaniṣad* 1.9.1.

[2] *Taittirīyopaniṣad* 2. 7.

[3] यदा पश्यः पश्यते स्वमवर्णं, कर्तारमीशं पुरुषं ब्रह्मयोनिम् । *Muṇḍakopaniṣad* 3.1.3.

[4] Ibid. 1.1.6.

[5] *Taittirīyopaniṣad* 2.6.

[6] According to the *Vivaraṇa* school the pure consciousness, i.e., the ultimate reality is both the material and the efficient cause of creation only in its qualified state, i.e , with *māyā* as the limitating factor. Cf. जगदुपादानमायाश्रयतया ब्रह्म कारणम् *Pañcapādikāvivaraṇa* p. 652; रज्ज्वाः संयुक्तसूत्रद्वयवन्मायाविशिष्टं ब्रह्म कारणम् Ibid; उपक्रमादिभिर्लिंगैस्तात्पर्यस्य विचारणात् । असंगं ब्रह्म मायावी सृजत्येष महेश्वरः ॥ *Pañcadaśī* 6.195; मायाधीनश्चिदाभासः श्रुतौ मायी महेश्वरः । अन्तर्यामी च सर्वज्ञो जगद्योनिः स एव हि ॥ Ibid, 6. 157.

[7] According to the theory of *dṛṣṭisṛṣṭivāda*, as propounded by Prakāśānanda, the soul is the main cause of the unreal appearance of the manifold universe because the avidyā or māyā, the material cause of creation, belongs to it. Cf. आत्मन्येव जगत्सर्वं दृष्टिमात्रमतत्त्वकम् । उद्भूय स्थितिमास्थाय विनश्यति मुहुर्मुहुः ॥ *Vedāntasiddhāntamuktāvalī* 22; एवञ्च स्वाविद्यया जीवभावमापन्नस्यैव ब्रह्मणः प्रपञ्चकल्पकत्वादीश्वरोऽपि सह सर्वज्ञत्वादिधर्मैः स्वप्नोपलब्धदेवतावज्जीवकल्पित इत्याचक्षते । *Siddhāntaleśa-*

ṣaṅgraha p. 105; मायैवोपादानं, ब्रह्म तदाधारभूततया । गौण्योपादानमिति प्राहुर्मुक्तावलीकाराः ॥ *Siddhāntakalpavallī* 27.

[1] तस्मात्सर्वज्ञं ब्रह्म जगतः कारणं नाचेतनं प्रधानमन्यद्वेति सिद्धम् *Śāṅkarabhāṣya* 1.1.11.

[2] सर्वविकारसृष्टिश्च न परस्मादात्मनोऽन्यत्रोपपद्यते । *Śāṅkarabhāṣya* 1.1.16; परस्माद् हि ब्रह्मणो भूतानामुत्पत्तिरिति वेदान्तेषु मर्यादा । Ibid, 1.1.22; परमेश्वरश्च सर्वजगतः कर्ता सर्ववेदान्तेष्ववधारितः । Ibid, 1.4.16; कार्यमाकाशादिकं बहुप्रपञ्चं जगत्कारणं परं ब्रह्म Ibid, 2.1.14; सन्मूलमेकमेवाद्वितीयं परमार्थसत्यं तदस्य जगतो मूलम् । *Chāndogyabhāṣya* 6.8.7; सर्ववेदान्तेषु सृष्टिस्थितिसंहारकारणत्वेन ब्रह्मणः प्रसिद्धत्वात् *Śāṅkarabhāṣya* 1.2.9; सर्व एवात्मनो व्युच्चरन्ति इति चोपाधिमतामात्मनामन्यतो व्युच्चरणमामनन्तः परमात्मानमेव कारणत्वेनामनन्ति । Ibid, 1.4.18; सर्वस्य हि विकारजातस्य सानन्दमयस्य कारणत्वेन व्यपदिश्यते । Ibid 1.1.20; परस्माच्च ब्रह्मणः प्राणादिकं जगज्जायते इति वेदान्तमर्यादा । Ibid, 1.4.18; अक्षरात्परतः परः इत्यत्रापि न प्रकृताद् भूतयोनेरक्षरात्परः कश्चिदभिधीयते । Ibid, 1.2.21.

[3] अत आगमवशेनागमानुसारितर्कवशेन च चेतनं ब्रह्म जगतः कारणं प्रकृतिश्चेति स्थितम् Ibid, 2.1.11.

[4] सर्वं च तद् ज्ञस्वरूपञ्चेति सर्वज्ञम् *Māṇḍūkyakārikābhāṣya* 3.36; सर्वभावानां च तेनाविभक्तदेशकालत्वात्, कालाकाशादिकारणत्वाच्च, निरतिशयसूक्ष्मत्वाच्च न तस्यान्यदविज्ञेयं सूक्ष्मं व्यवहितम् विप्रकृष्टं भूतं भवद् भविष्यद्वास्ति तस्मात्सर्वज्ञं तद्ब्रह्मेति *Taittirīyopaniṣadbhāṣya* 2.1; उपाधिपरिच्छिन्नज्ञानस्य सर्वज्ञत्वाद्यसम्भवः *Śāṅkarabhāṣya* 1.3.4.

[5] Cf. tbe six stages or phases of existence enumerated by Yāska: देहो जायते-अस्ति-वर्द्धते-विपरिणमते-अपक्षीयते-नश्यति *Nirukta* 1.1.1.

[6] *Śāṅkarabhāṣya* 1.1.2.

[7] अस्य जगतो नामरूपाभ्यां व्याकृतस्य अनेककर्तृभोक्तृसंयुक्तस्य प्रतिनियतदेशकालनिमित्तक्रियाफलाश्रयस्य मनसा अपि अचिन्त्यरचनारूपस्य जन्मस्थितिभङ्गं यतः सर्वज्ञात् सर्वशक्तेः कारणाद् भवति तद् ब्रह्म इति । Ibid.

However, the apparent act of creation or manifold appearance of the universe does not pertain to the immutable, attributeless and pure reality which is its origin, because the characteristics of cause may qualify the effect but not *vice versa*[1]. For example, the creation or appearance of snake which originates in the rope, its cause (or source of its real existence), cannot be said to constitute a characteristic or the nature of the rope which remains unchanged or undifferentiated[2].

(B) *The Concept of Causation*

Before analyzing the concept of causation with reference to the theory of creation, as propounded by the Śāṅkara school, we may conveniently point out the three levels or aspects of existence based on experience, as have been suggested by Śaṅkarācārya. Parabrahman is the only essentially true metaphysical reality or *pāramārthikī sattā*, because, its existence is never limited in respect of time (i. e. in present, past and future). The second level of existence, which is totally unreal even from the point of view of worldly appearance, can be illustrated by the knowledge of snake (due to delusion or mistake), which is proved incorrect, in a matter of moments, when we clearly come to realize that it was a rope. This false momentary appearance is called the apparent reality or *prātibhāsikī sattā*. The third level or phase of existence which we experience in the matter-of-fact world and on which are based our day-to-day dealings is called the practical reality or *vyāvahārikī sattā*.

The creation of this practically true state of the existence of the things of the world, like the jīva etc. can be explained or reasonably demonstrated in this very vyāvahārikī sattā. On the highest plane, therefore, there is no diversity or duality (*dvaita*) and hence no creation is possible. The second level of existence is clearly (i. e. quite convincingly) unreal as shown above. The third state of existence is only practically (*vyavahārataḥ*) real but not absolutely or essentially (*tattvataḥ*) so from the view-point of the transcendental or absolutely monistic (*advaita*) aspect of reality[1] (pāramārthikī sattā)[2].

---

[1] अनन्यत्वेऽपि कार्यकारणयोः कार्यस्य कारणात्मत्वं न तु कारणस्य कार्यात्मत्वम् 'आरम्भणशब्दादिभ्य' इति वक्ष्यामः । *Śāṅkarabhāṣya* 2.1.9.

[2] अविशेषेण त्रिष्वपि कालेषु कार्यस्य कारणानन्यत्वं श्राव्यते । तत्र यः परिहारः कार्यस्य तद्धर्मणाञ्चा-विद्याध्यारोपितत्वान्न तैः कारणं संसृज्यत इति…एवं परमात्मापि संसारमायया न संस्पृश्यत इति । Ibid,

The concept of causation implies, therefore, according to the Śāṅkaravedānta, that the effect is non-existent (asat) on account of its having only an illusory appearance and that the cause alone exists due to the fact of its being absolute existent (paramārthasat). It can, then, aptly be described as *satkāraṇavāda* because the substrate of all the illusory effects is absolutely real, and, on the other hand, may also be taken as a type of *satkāryavāda* (i. e. the belief in the existence of effect even prior to its manifestation), from which (i. e. the latter), however, it greatly departs in view of the strictly idealistic non-dual reality it preaches.

---

[1] अपि च नेयं पारमार्थिकी सृष्टिश्रुति : येनायुज्येत प्रयोजनम् । न हि द्विचन्द्रालातचक्रगन्धर्वनगरादिविभ्रमा समुद्दिष्टप्रयोजना भवन्ति । *Bhāmatī* 2.1.33.

[2] Thus, regarding the practical or created reality of soul (jīva) etc. it is said : अविद्याप्रत्युपस्थापितकार्यकारणोपाधिनिमित्तोऽयं शारीरान्तर्यामिणोर्भेदव्यपदेशो न पारमार्थिकः। एको हि प्रत्यगात्मा भवति न द्वौ प्रत्यागात्मानौ सम्भवतः एकस्यैव तु भेदव्यवहार उपाधिकृतः, यथा घटाकाशो महाकाश इति । ततश्च ज्ञातृज्ञेयादिभेदश्रुतयः प्रत्यक्षादीनि च प्रमाणानि संसारानुभवो विधिप्रतिषेधशास्त्रं चेति सर्वमेतदुपपद्यते । तथा च श्रुतिः—'यत्र हि द्वैतमिव भवति तदितर इतरं पश्यति' इत्यविद्याविषयं व्यवहारं दर्शयति । 'यत्र त्वस्य सर्वमात्मैवाभूत्तत्केन कं पश्येत्' इति विद्याविषये सर्वं व्यवहारं वारयति । Ibid 1.2.20; यस्मिन् सर्वाणि भूतान्यात्मैवाभूद्विजानतः । तत्र को मोहः कः शोक एकत्वमनुपश्यतः ।। *Īśāvāsyopaniṣad* 7; हिरण्मयेन पात्रेण सत्यस्यापिहितं मुखम् । तत्त्वं पूषन्नपावृणु सत्यधर्माय दृष्टये ।। Ibid, 15; यत् सत्यस्य सत्यम् *Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad* 2.1.20,

Theory of creation, then, is also unreal from the view-point of true existence. The apparent or undeniably practical existence of the created universe is caused by ignorance (*avidyā*)[1].

Thus, the created universe is not a real product or effect (*vikāra*) but only an unreal or illusory appearance (*vivarta*)[2]. It is in this context that the oft-quoted statement of an advaitavedāntin viz., '*brahma satyaṁ jaganmithyā*' can be properly understood. In other words, according to Saṅkarācārya, there is in reality (i. e., in the ideal or absolute aspect of existence) nothing else than the one uncreated or unborn principle (viz., ātman or Brahman) and the creation (viz., prapañca) of practical realities is only an experience or phenomenon due to avidyā[3]. It is declared, therefore, that the passages setting forth the creation (sṛṣṭi) and so on subserve the purpose of teaching Brahman (i. e. the Absolute Reality) and although these (i. e. the passages) may be conflicting with regard to the order of the things created such as the ākāśa and so on, they do not conflict with regard to the creator on account of its being represented as uniformly described in them[4].

---

1. See f. n. 2 on p. 142.
2. अतत्त्वतोऽन्यथा प्रथा विवर्त इत्युदाहृतः । सतत्त्वतोऽन्यथा प्रथा विकार इत्युदीरितः ।। *Vedāntasāra* by Sadānanda (*apavādavarṇana*).
3. Cf. वाचारम्भणं विकारो नामधेयं मृत्तिकेत्येव सत्यम् । *Chāndogyopaniṣad* 6.1.4; इदं सर्वं यदयमात्मा *Bṛhadāraṇyka Upaniṣad* 2.4.6; विज्ञानात्मपरमात्मनोरविद्याप्रत्युपस्थापितनामरूपरचितदेहाद्युपाधिनिमित्तो भेदो न पारमार्थिक इत्येषोऽर्थः सर्ववेदान्तवादिभिरभ्युपगन्तव्य *Śāṅkarabhāṣya* 1.4.22; ब्रह्मावगतिर्हि पुरुषार्थः निःशेषसंसारबीजाविद्याद्यनर्थनिबर्हणात् Ibid, 1.1.1; एको वशी सदेव सोम्येदमग्र आसीदेकमेवाद्वितीयम् *Chāndogyopaniṣad* 6.2.1; सर्वभूतान्तरात्मा एकं रूपं बहुधा यः करोति *Kaṭhopaniṣad* 2.5.12; नेह नानास्ति किञ्चन *Bṛhadāraṇyakopaniṣad* 4.4.19.
4. भवेदपि कार्यस्य विगीतत्वमप्रतिपाद्यत्वात्, न ह्ययं सृष्ट्यादिप्रपञ्चः प्रतिपिपादयिषितः । न हि तत्प्रतिबद्धः कश्चित् पुरुषार्थो दृश्यते श्रूयते वा, न च कल्पयितुं शक्यते, उपक्रमोपसंहाराभ्यां तत्र

(C) *The Role of Māyā or Avidyā in Creation*

The appearance of the manifold objects, which are unreal (as mentioned above), is superimposed on the uniform existence. The former (i. e., the manifold objects) are known as non-self or non-reality (*anātman* or *avastu*) and the latter (i.e., the uniform existence) is known as the self or the reality of pure existence (*sattā*), consciousness (*caitanya*) and bliss (*ānanda*) (viz., ātman or brahman). This beginningless phenomenon of super-imposition (technically denoted by the term *adhyāsa*)[1] is caused by wrong knowledge (avidyā) whose removal is the chief aim of the advaitavedānta.[2] The characteristics of createdness and manifoldness etc. as evident in non-reality, are entirely opposed to reality to which they are erroneously attributed. The practical state of existence or illusion appears as real only as long as the knowledge (vidyā)[3] of the truth or absolute reality has not disproved or ended

---

ब्रह्मविषयैर्वाक्यैः साकमेकवाक्यताया गम्यमानत्वात् । दर्शयति च सृष्ट्यादिप्रपञ्चस्य ब्रह्मप्रतिपत्त्यर्थताम्—'अन्नेन सोम्य शुङ्गेनापोमूलमन्विच्छद्भिः सोम्य शुङ्गेन तेजोमूलमन्विच्छ तेजसा सोम्य शुङ्गेन सन्मूलमन्विच्छ' (छा० 6/8/4) इति । मृदादिदृष्टान्तैश्च कार्यस्य कारणेनाभेदं वदितुं सृष्ट्यादिप्रपञ्चः श्राव्यते इति गम्यते । तथा च सम्प्रदायविदो वदन्ति—'मृल्लोहविस्फुलिङ्गाद्यैः सृष्टिर्या चोदिताऽन्यथा । उपायः सोऽवताराय नास्ति भेदः कथञ्चन ।। (माण्डू० 3/25) *Śāṅkarabhāṣya* 1.4.14.

1. तमेतं लक्षणमध्यासं पण्डिता अविद्येति मन्यन्ते । *Śāṅkarabhāṣya* 1.1.1; रज्ज्वां सर्पवदात्मनि द्वैतस्याध्यस्तत्वात् । कथम् ? सुख्यहं दुःखी मूढो जातो मृतो जीर्णो देहवान् पश्यामि व्यक्तोऽव्यक्तः कर्ता फली संयुक्तो वियुक्तः क्षीणो वृद्धो ममैत इत्येवमादयः सर्वे आत्मन्यध्यारोप्यन्ते । आत्मैतेष्वनुगतः सर्वत्राव्यभिचारात् । यथा सर्पधारणादिभेदेषु रज्जुः । *Māṇḍūkyakārikābhāṣya* 2.32; एवमयमनादिरनन्तो नैसर्गिकोऽध्यासो मिथ्याप्रत्ययरूपः कर्तृत्वभोक्तृत्वप्रवर्तकः सर्वलोकप्रत्यक्षः । अस्यानर्थहेतोः प्रहाणाय आत्मैकत्वविद्याप्रतिपत्तये सर्वे वेदान्ता आरभ्यन्ते । यथा चायमर्थः सर्वेषां वेदान्तानां तथा वयमस्यां शारीरकमीमांसायां प्रदर्शयिष्यामः । See *Adhyāsabhāṣya* at the beginning of *Śāṅkarabhāṣya*.
2. Ibid,
3. अविद्यायाश्च विद्याविरोधित्वान्निवृत्तिः ।... विद्यायां हि सत्यां उदिते सवितरि शार्वरमिव तमः प्रणाशमुपैत्यविद्या । *Gītābhāṣya* 2.69; सकृदुत्पन्नैव ह्यात्मप्रतिपत्तिरविद्यां निवर्तयति *Śāṅkarabhāṣya* 4.1.2.

it (i. e., the avidyā). In this way, we find that the avidyā plays a most vital role in the theory of creation according to the Śāṅkaravedānta.

Illusion or wrong knowledge, however, cannot take place in void, i. e., it always has some basic[1] reality which lies temporarily concealed during its operation. For example, the practical reality (vyāvahārikī sattā) of the pearl-oyster lies concealed to the viewer as long as the super-imposition of the unreal silver due to wrong knowledge is not destroyed by subsequent knowledge of its reality (tattvajñāna). In the case of the illusion or false appearance of the practical diversity or duality of existence (i. e. prapañca) or creation (sṛṣṭi) the essential unity of reality lies concealed[2].

Thus, the concept and the role of avidyā in creation, as revealed in the Śāṅkaravedānta, clearly demonstrates the erroneousness, illusoriness and unreality of the phenomenon of creation. Also, it is evident from the above that avidyā as manifested in these illusions is not the cause but only a *via media* for the causality of Brahman in the process of creation[3]. Further, all the distinctions or differentiations as cause and effect or as the productive and the produced among the various

---

1. ते च प्राणादिभावा अप्यद्वयेनैव सतात्मना विकल्पिता न हि निरास्पदा काचित् कल्पनोपपद्यते । *Māṇḍūkyabhāṣya* 2.33.
2. ऐकात्म्याप्रतिपत्तिर्या स्वात्मानुभवसंश्रया । साविद्या संभूतेर्बीजं तन्नाशो मुक्तिरात्मनः *Naiṣkarmyasiddhi* 1.7.
3. एवं परमात्मनः तमः प्रतिबिम्बकं जगत्कर्तृत्वं व्रजतीत्येके नैतद् युक्तम् । परमचैतन्यमेवात्मशब्देनोच्यते । शाबल्यद्वारा तात्पर्यविषयीभूतशुद्धात्माविवेकात्तेषामेवं भ्रमो जायते । *Śaṅkṣepaśārīraka* 1.33.3; संक्षेपशारीरिककृतस्तु ब्रह्मैवोपादानं कूटस्थस्य स्वतः कारणत्वानुपपत्तेर्माया द्वारकारणमकारणमपि कार्येष्वनुगच्छति मृद इव तद्गतश्लक्ष्णत्वादेरपि घटेऽनुगमदर्शनादित्याहुः । *Siddhāntaleśasaṅgraha* by Appayya Dīkṣita (Ed. Mm. Gaṅgādhara Sāstrī Mānavalli), p. 13.

things and experiences of the universe are only imposed and imaginary[1].

(D) *The Process of Creation and Dissolution*

We have already seen how the illusory appearance of the universe, its existence from the practical worldly aspect, and the disappearance of that false super-imposition respectively are really meant by the universe being created, being existent and getting dissolved.

Now, the order in which the things of the world are created has been described by Śaṅkarācārya in the following manner.[2]

The attributeless Brahman in its supremely pure form begins to appear as conditioned or qualified by the attribute or limitation of *māyā* no sooner than the unmanifest (avyakta) māyā inclines towards manifestation. This is the *prājña* state from the individualistic aspect of Brahman which in its total aspect is called the Inner Controller, the Lord (*antaryāmin īśvara*). In view of the totality of the above conditioning factor this itself is the Blissful Reality (ānandamaya Brahman). The limitation of Brahman at this stage is called the causal conditioning (*kāraṇopādhi*).

After this, the Brahman when qualified by more manifest names and forms of māyā in totality, is called the Golden Embryo (*hiraṇyagarbha*). Brahman in this second stage when qualified by the minute conditioning (*sūkṣmopādhi*) in its individual aspect is called *taijasa*.

Afterwards comes the third stage of the gross conditioning (*sthūlopādhi*) in its total aspect when the embodied Brahman is known as 'all beings' (*vaiśvānara*) or even as the Ruler of all the created beings (*prajāpati*). Brahman at this stage of gross conditioning in its individual aspect is called the *viśva*.

---

[1] एवामाकाशस्थानीयात्परमात्मनः पृथिव्यादिभूतसंघाता आध्यात्मिकाश्च कार्यकारणलक्षणा रज्जुसर्पवद्विकल्पिता जायन्ते । *Māṇḍūkya Bhāṣya* 3.3.

[2] *Aitareyopaniṣadbhāṣya* 3.1.3.

The differentiation of or manifold manifestaion as names and forms of the *avyakta māyā* in the material creation also in order of the ether (ākāśa) etc.[1] is in the same three stages of *kāraṇa, sūksma* and *sthūla*[2]. In the last stage, the creation or production of gross elements viz., the ākāśa etc. is by way of the process of quintuplication (*pañcīkaraṇa*) of the formerly minute elements.[3]

The Prajāpati under the limitations of the gross forms (i. e., in both the conscious and the material fields) alone is liable to be created, to subsist and to be dissolved in the forms of various living beings and inert objects right from the Brahmā to the tuft of grass (at the lowest level).

Each of the above stages (avasthās) of the Brahman is described as the effect of its preceding stage, even as the earthen lump of clay (*mṛttikā*) and the jar (*ghaṭa*) are known as cause and effect respectively in the process of creation. This latter designation of being cause and effect, however, as already mentioned elsewhere is related to the practical world (vyavahārajagat).

---

1. Cf. तस्माद्वा एतस्मादात्मन आकाशः सम्भूतः आकाशाद्वायुः वायोरग्निरग्नेरापः अद्भ्यः पृथिवी *Taittirīya Upaniṣad* 2.1.
2. ओं पञ्चीकृतपञ्चमहाभूतानि तत्कार्यं सर्वं विराडित्युच्यते । एतत्स्थूलशरीरमात्मनः । इन्द्रियैरर्थोपलब्धिर्जागरितम् । एतदुभयाभिमान्यात्मा विश्वः । एतत्त्रयमकारः ॥ अपञ्चीकृतपञ्चमहाभूतानि पञ्चतन्मात्राणि, तत्कार्यं च पञ्चप्राणाः दशेन्द्रियाणि मनो बुद्धिश्चेति सप्तदशकं लिंगं भौतिकं हिरण्यगर्भ इत्युच्यते । एतत्सूक्ष्मशरीरमात्मनः । करणेषूपहतेषु जागरितसंस्कारजः प्रत्ययः सविषयः स्वप्न इत्युच्यते । तदुभयाभिमान्यात्मा तैजसः । एतत्त्रयमुकारः ॥ शरीरद्वयकारणमात्माज्ञानं साभासमव्याकृतमित्युच्यते । एतत्कारणशरीरमात्मानः । तच्च न सत् नासत् । नापि सदसत् । न भिन्नम् नाभिन्नम् नापि भिन्नाभिन्नं कुतश्चित् । न निरवयवम् न सावयवम् नोभयम् किं तु केवलब्रह्मैकत्वज्ञानापनोद्यम् । सर्वप्रकारज्ञानोपसंहारे बुद्धेः कारणात्मनावस्थानं सुपुप्तिः । तदुभयाभिमान्यात्मा प्राज्ञः । एतत्त्रयं मकारः ॥ *Pañcīkaraṇaṁ*.
3. पञ्चानां भूतानामेकैकं द्विधा विभज्य स्वार्धभागं विहायार्धभागं चतुर्धा विभज्येतरेषु योजिते पञ्चीकरणं मायारूपदर्शनमध्यारोपापवादाभ्यां निष्प्रपंचं प्रपञ्च्यते । *Pañcīkaraṇaṁ* by Śaṅkarācārya (*The works of Srī Sankarācharya* p. 189-190). Cf. Also द्विधा विधाय चैकैकं चतुर्धा प्रथमं पुनः । स्वस्वेतरद्वितीयांशैर्योजनात्पञ्च ते । *Pañcadaśī* 1.27.

The omniscient Lord of all (i. e., Brahman with the attribute or condition of His power[1] or māyā) is the cause of the creation of this universe in the same way as clay is the material cause of the jars and as gold is that of the golden ornaments; by His rulership He is the cause of the subsistence of this universe once created, just as the magician is the cause of the subsistence of the magical illusion; and lastly He is the cause of this created world being finally resolved or dissolved into Himself just as the four classes of beings viz., the womb-born (jarāyuja) etc. are absorbed into the earth (pṛthivī).[2]

The theory of creation according to the Śāṅkaravedānta also envisages periodicity of the process of creation and dissolution like that in several other orthodox schools of Indian Philosophy. Also the order of creation is exactly the same in each creation and that of dissolution in the reverse order is also similar. The phenomenal world is the same in all *kalpas* or cycles of existence (cf. the popular Indian concept of creation and dissolution regularly succeeding each other after equal duration). The gods like the Hiraṇyagarbha etc. manifest themselves in each new creation and continue their previous forms of existence therein. The common beings bear the same names and forms as in the preceding creation, and owing to this similarity of names and forms, the admitted periodical renovations of the universe in the form of general creations after general (i. e., total) annihilations, are expressly mentioned by *śruti* as well as *smṛti* according to the Śāṁkara school[3].

[1] Cf. इन्द्रो मायाभिः पुरुरूप ईयते *Ṛgveda* 6.47.18; देवात्मशक्तिं स्वगुणैर्निगूढाम् *Śvaetāśvataropaniṣad* 1.3.

[2] सर्वज्ञः सर्वेश्वरो जगत उत्पत्तिकारणं मृत्सुवर्णादय इव घटरुचकादीनाम् । उत्पन्नस्य जगतो नियन्तृत्वेन स्थितिकारणं, मायावीव मायायाः । प्रसारितस्य च जगतः: पुन स्वात्मन्येवोपसंहारकारणम्, अवनिरिव चतुर्विधभूतग्रामस्य । स एव च सर्वेषां न आत्मेत्येतद्वेदान्तवाक्यसमन्वयप्रतिपादनेन प्रतिपादितम् । *Śāṅkarabhāṣya* 2.1.1.

[3] *Śāṅkarabhāṣya* 1.3.30; सूर्याचन्द्रमसौ धाता यथापूर्वमकल्पयत् । दिवञ्च पृथिवीं चान्तरिक्षमथो

(*E*) *The Purpose of Creation*

The theory of creation, as we have so far evaluated, refers to the apparent world only which is characterised by name and form—the figments of wrong knowledge or nescience. It, moreover, aims at intimating to us that Brahman is the immutable (akṣara)[1] self (i. e., the basic reality) of everything[2].

Again, Brahman's creative activity (if we must use the terms) is due to mere sport (līlā) such as we find in ordinary life. This assertion is in reply to the common reasoning that not even a senseless person acts without some purpose. The activity proceeding from or arising out of mere sportfulness may be illustrated by the instances of recreation in places of amusement indulged into by the princes or highly prosperous persons who have no unfulfilled desires and, hence, none extraneous purpose whatsoever. The activity of the Lord, the Omniscient and Omnipotent Brahman, may be supposed to be mere sport proceeding from His own nature just like the process of inhalation and exhalation in the body. Brahman being omniscient and omnipotent cannot be said to have a desire unfulfilled, hence, the need for justifying His activity even without a selfish motive, is understandable in the Śāṅkaravedānta[3].

स्वः ॥ *Ṛgveda* 10.190.3; *Taittirīya Brāhmaṇa* 3.1.4. ऋषीणां नामधेयानि याश्च वेदेषु दृष्टयः । शक्यन्ते प्रसूतानां तान्येवैभ्यो ददात्यजः ।। यथर्तुष्वृतुलिगानि नानारूपाणि पर्यये । दृश्यन्ते तानि तान्येव तथा भावा युगादिषु ।। यथाभिमानिनोऽतीतास्तुल्यास्ते साम्प्रतैरिह । देवा देवैरतीतैर्हि रूपैर्नामभिरेव च ।। quoted in Ibid.

[1] *Śāṅkarabhāṣya* 1.3.3.

[2] न चेयं परमार्थविषया सृष्टिश्रुतिः अविद्याकल्पितनामरूपव्यवहारगोचरत्वात् ब्रह्मात्मभावप्रतिपादनपरत्वाच्चेत्येतदपि नैव विस्मर्तव्यम् । Ibid. 2.1.33; Cf. देवस्यैष स्वभावोऽयमाप्तकामस्य का स्पृहा *Māṇḍūkyakārikā* 1.9.

[3] *Śāṅkarabhāṣya* 2.1.33.

III. The Bhāskara School

(A) Brahman and the Concept of Causation

The Brahman or ultimate reality manifests Himself through all the effects of the created universe[1]. This is called the transformation or change (pariṇāma) pertaining to the Brahman[2]. Thus, the created universe being the pariṇāma of Brahman has identical and, hence, essential as well as real existence along with its material cause viz., the Brahman[3]. In this manner, the 'one' ultimate principle or reality (i. e., Brahman) has been described as having 'two' aspects or states[4] viz., that of the essential or causal (i. e. *svarūpāvasthā*) and the other pertaining to the effects (i. e. *kāryāvasthā*). Cause and effect (as two aspects of the one principle) constitute the concept of unity (abheda), and, the independent reality of the effects as pariṇāmas, side by side with the above-mentioned monism, constitutes the concept of difference (bheda) in the concept of causation according to this school. The Brahman has unthinkable and infinite powers (śaktis) which He reflects externally out of Himself during the process of creation as well as during existence, and draws inwards within Himself at the end during the process of dissolution in a periodic

[1] परमात्मा स्वयमात्मानं कार्यत्वेन परिणामयामास। *Bhāskarabhāṣya* 1.4.25. Cf. तदात्मानं स्वयमकुरुत *Taittirīya Upaniṣad* 2.7.

[2] ब्रह्मपरिणतेरिति भास्करगोत्रे युज्यते। *Nyāyakusumāñjali* 2.3.332; 'The philosophy of Bhedābheda pariṇama is the principle of self-differentiation of Brahman or the real limiting adjuncts or upādhis that inhere in Brahman'. Cf. *The Philosophy of Bhedābheda* by P. N. Śrīnivāsācārya (referred to in वेदान्त में भास्कर का स्थान तथा उनके ब्रह्मसूत्र-भाष्य की आलोचनात्मक समीक्षा a D. Phil. Thesis of the University of Allahabad written by Dr. Shail Kumari, p. 258).

[3] परिणामो नाम उपादानसमसत्ताककार्यापत्तिः, विवर्तो नाम उपादानविषमसत्ताककार्यापत्तिः *Vedāntaparibhāṣā* by Dharmarājādhvarīndra, pp. 87-88.

[4] परमात्मनोऽवस्थाविशेषः प्रपञ्चोऽयम्। *Bhāskarabhāṣya* 2.1.14,

14213
राष्ट्रीय संस्कृत संस्थान
जयपुर
पुस्तकालय

cycle, just as the sun does in respect of its rays in the morning and in the evening respectively[1]. The universe as an effect (pariṇāma) caused by the Brahman[2], consists of the category of subjective, conscious and experiencing souls (i. e. the jīvas) as well as of the category of the unconscious objects like the ether (ākāśa) etc. This twofold creation has been held to be caused by a similar division of the śaktis of the Lord (or Brahman)[3].

Regarding the nature of causation Bhāskara says that the so-called components or parts (avayavas) cannot be logically held to be the origin or, for that matter, to belong to the material cause of the effect[4].

The cause, having no parts, in the process of production, has been illustrated by the effects such as lust, anger, greed, infatuation etc. produced out of the whole or partless cause viz., the mind (manas) which does not forsake[5] its essential identity or individuality in the process of its natural transformation or pariṇāma. The apparently different waves as effects are produced out of the self-same

---

1. शक्तिविक्षेपं कृतवान् । अनन्ताः हि तस्य शक्तयोऽचिन्त्याश्च । तासां विक्षेपं करोति सृष्टिस्थितिकाले यथा सूर्य्यो रश्मीनाम् । तद्वदेव संहरति । *Bhāskarabhāṣya* 1.4.25.
2. अयमेव छान्दोग्ये वाक्यकारवृत्तिकाराभ्यां सम्प्रदायमतः समाश्रितः । तथा च वाक्यं परिणामस्तु स्याद् दध्यादिवत् Ibid on आत्मकृतेश्च परिणामात् । *Brahmasūtra* 1.4.25.
3. शक्तिविक्षेपलक्षणः परिणाम इतीश्वरस्य द्वे शक्ती भवतो भोग्यशक्तिरेका भोक्तृशक्तिश्चापरा । या भोग्यशक्तिः साकाशादिरूपेणाचेतनपरिणामापत्तेः या भोक्तृशक्तिः सा चेतनजीवरूपेणावतिष्ठते । *Bhāskarabhāṣya* 2.1.17.
4. न सावयवत्वं तत्र परिणतिहेतुः । यदि स्यात् अम्बुनोऽपि दधिभावेन परिणामः स्यात् । अतोऽप्रयोजकं सावयवत्वम् । Ibid, 2.1.14; ये चावयवानामवयवाः कल्पितास्ते किं परिणमन्ते न वेति । यदि न परिणमेरन् दधनि पयः दृश्यते । तस्मात् सर्वेषामवयवानां परिणामित्वमेष्टव्यम् किं चावयवानामवयवकल्पने ह्यनवस्था । क्षीरसमुद्रश्च कुण्डे स्यादवयवानामानन्त्यात् । Ibid; तस्मान्निरवयवस्यैव परिणामो दृश्यते । Ibid.
5. अप्रच्युतस्वरूपस्य शक्तिविक्षेपलक्षणः परिणामो यथा तन्तुनाभस्य पटतन्तुवत् । पटवच्च । यथा प्रच्युतस्वरूपाणां तन्तूनां पटात्मनावस्थानम् । यथाकाशादप्रच्युतस्वभावाद् वायुरुत्पद्यते । Ibid.

sea which causes them[1]. Pariṇāma is produced by only the own nature (svabhāva) of the cause. For example, curd is produced due to the svabhāva or śakti of milk[2]. Thus, the cause manifests itself as the effects due to its own nature or potency and also without losing its essential identity or unity even in the created state[3]. Thus, the 'one' omniscient, omnipotent Brahman, too, transforms Himself into the created universe at His will and merely due to His very svabhāva or inherent śaktis[4].

Then, Brahman is both the material[5] (upādāna) as well as the efficient (nimitta) cause of the creation of the universe[6] - because

---

[1] न च निरवयवस्य परिणामो नास्ति । यथा मनसः कामक्रोधलोभमोहादय परस्परविलक्षणाः समुद्रोर्मय इवोद्भवन्ति । मनः स्वरूपं चाप्रच्युतम् । *Bhāskarabhāṣya* 2.1.14.

[2] परिणामस्वाभाव्यादेव हि पयः परिणमते । Ibid.

[3] अप्रच्युतस्वरूपस्य शक्तिविक्षेपलक्षणः परिणामो etc. Ibid, 2.1.14; ब्रह्मात्मको हि नामरूपप्रपञ्चो न प्रपञ्चात्मकं ब्रह्म । Ibid, 3.2.11; भोक्तृभोग्यनियन्तृरूपस्य प्रपञ्चस्य ब्रह्मात्मता न प्रपञ्चरूपता ब्रह्मणः । Ibid, 3.2.13.

[4] परिणामस्वाभाव्यात् क्षीरवत् सर्वज्ञत्वाच्च सर्वशक्तित्वाच्च स्वेच्छया परिणमेदात्मानम् Ibid, 2.1.14; स हि स्वेच्छया स्वात्मानं लोकहितार्थं परिणामयन् स्वशक्त्यनुसारेण परिणामयति । Ibid.

[5] Cf. जन्माद्यस्य यत इत्युपादानकारणविवक्षयोक्तम् । Ibid, 1.3.28.

[6] प्रकृतिरुपादानकारणं च शब्दान्निमित्तकारणं च Ibid, 1.4.22; The help of material or instrumental causes, as evident in the case of a worldly conscious agent (e. g. in the case of the production of the jar or the piece of cloth etc.), is not required in the phenomenon of universal creation, because, in the first place, the Brahman is omnipotent (Cf. परास्य शक्तिर्विविधैव श्रूयते *Śvetāśvataropaniṣad* 1.3) and omniscient (Cf. यः सर्वज्ञः सर्ववित् *Muṇḍakopaniṣad* 1.2.9), and also because of the fact that manifestation or creativity is His very nature or innate potentiality. Cf. ब्रह्म स्वत एव परिणमते स्वाभाव्यात् । यथा क्षीरं दधिभावाय अम्भो हिमभावाय । *Bhāskarabhāṣya* 2.1.24. The Supreme Conscious Being can create even unconscious and varied objects etc. without outer material. Cf. यथा देवा महर्षयः बाह्यसाधनमनपेक्ष्य विचित्रकार्याणि वितन्वते अणिमाद्यैश्वर्ययोगादिति योगशास्त्रपुराणादिषु etc. Ibid, 2.1.25.

He alone is called as the cause and as the effect in the different states or aspects of existence, viz., those of the unmanifest and the manifest, even like the bunyan tree as an effect, is produced by and out of its self-same seed. Just like the jar or necklace etc. respectively are only different states or manifestations as effects of the lump of clay or gold etc. as causes, similarly, the created universe consisting of the conscious and the unconscious beings, is the manifested state as effect of the original or causal unmanifested state of the one Brahman[1].

Creation from the essentially intact or self-same cause viz., the ātman or Brahman (as, for example, in the case of that of the objects of dream) is also supported by the scriptures[2] in addition to the ordinary examples from our worldly experience (e. g., that of curd from the milk)[3].

One may object that the milk is found entirely or totally changed in its state of production viz., that of the curd and it no longer exists as a separate identity. To this, Bhāskara replies, that all the features or details of an illustration are never implied or acceptable in the original case. Further, we do not find similarity of śakti in the various cases even in our worldly experience. In fact to grasp or determine the order of the infinite creative capacity or variety of the causal energy (pariṇāma śakti) of the Supreme Lord is well-nigh impossible for ordinary human beings.[1]

---

[1] बीजमेवाङ्कुराकारेणावस्थान्तरतया परिणमते । ibid, 2.2.26; कारणमेव तां तामवस्थां प्रतिपद्यमानं कार्यमिति गीयते । ibid, 2.1.18; योऽयं भूतयोनिः कारणात्मा स एव कार्यात्मनावस्थितम् ibid, 1.2.23; कारणमेव कार्यात्मना घटवदवतिष्ठते ibid, 2.1.14; Cf. तदनन्यत्वमारम्भणशब्दादिभ्यः । *Brahma Sūtra* 2.1.14; कारणस्यावस्थामात्रं कार्यम् *Bhāskarabhāṣya* on ibid; ब्रह्मैव कारणात्मना कार्यात्मना चावस्थितम् । *Bhāskarabhāṣya* 1.1.4.

[2] न कृत्स्नप्रसक्तिरप्रच्युतस्वरूपं ब्रह्म परिणमेत् । कथं । श्रुतेः । सेयं देवतैक्षत हन्ताहमिमास्तिस्रो देवता इति तेजोऽबन्नव्यतिरिक्तां परां देवतां दर्शयति । शब्दप्रमाणत्वाच्चास्यार्थस्य न स्वविकल्पेन चालयितुं शक्यते । Ibid, 2.1.17; Cf. न तत्र रथा न रथयोगा न पन्थानो भवन्त्यथ रथान् रथयोगान् पथः सृजते । *Bṛhadāraṇyakopaniṣad* 4.3.10.

[3] *Bhāskarabhāṣya* 2.1.14.

Thus, it is asserted that at the stage of the creation of the unconscious (acetana or jaḍa) physical elements (bhūtas) the Brahman exists separately as a conscious being[2].

(*B*) *The Order of Creation*

The order of creation according to Bhāskara is as follows :

First of all, after determining the right time for the fructification of the souls' destiny the Omnipotent God (or Brahman for that matter) creates the unmanifest (*avyākṛta*) pure-element (sūkṣmabhūta) viz., the ether (ākāśa)[3]. Later on, He produces the Hiraṇyagarbha[4] and having created Him He enters into Him[5] and, as such, goes on creating the gross (i. e., sthūla or mahā) bhūtas out of the sūkṣmabhūtas until the creation of the vast universe (brahmāṇḍa) has been finally achieved[6].

---

1. न हि सर्वात्मना दृष्टान्तसाधर्म्यं किञ्चिदुपपद्यते । यथा तावदचेतनानामेव परस्परं परिणामवैचित्र्यम् । क्षीरस्यैकः परिणामो दध्यवस्था । अन्नस्यानेकः केशनखदन्तपिशितादिलक्षणः । न हि भावानां शक्तयः केनचित् प्राकृतबुद्धिना परिच्छेत्तुं शक्यन्ते—किमुत चेतनस्य सर्वज्ञस्य सर्वशक्तेः स्वतन्त्रस्य परिणामो व्यवस्थाप्येत । *Bhāskarabhāṣya* 2.1.14.
2. आत्मन आकाशः सम्भूतस्तत्तेजोऽसृजतेत्यचेतनं महाभूतं सृजति स्वयं चेतनरूपेण पृथगेवावस्थितः ibid.
3. Ākāśa is indicative (*upalakṣaṇa*) here for all the five pure elements.
4. यः पूर्वस्मिन् जन्मनि द्वैतैकत्वभावनया प्रजापतिर्भविष्यामीति कर्म कृतवान् स हिरण्यगर्भ उच्यते । *Bhāskarabhāṣya* 1.3.28.
5. Cf. the concept of anupraveśa in the Upaniṣads (vide Ch. III pp. 40-41).
6. स च सर्वज्ञः प्राणिनामुपभोगकालं ज्ञात्वा प्रथमं भूतसूक्ष्ममव्याकृताकाशं सृजति तदनन्तरं हिरण्यगर्भं तस्मिन्ननुप्रविश्य तदात्मना स्थित्वाकाशादिक्रमेणाण्डं सृष्ट्वा ततः स्थावरपर्यन्तं सृजति प्राणिनां कर्मानुरूपेण । *Bhāskarabhāṣya* 1.3.30.

After having created the sūkṣmabhūtas and the Hiraṇyagarbha, Brahman produces the gross (sthūla) ākāśa[1] from which is produced the air (vāyu) together with sound or śabda belonging to its immediate cause viz., ākāśa and touch or sparśa, its own quality. Fire or heat (tejas) is produced from vāyu and the former is possessed of form or rūpa, in addition to śabda and sparśa belonging to its immediate cause. Next, are produced in the same manner, the water (jala) from tejas[2] and, thereafter, the earth (pṛthivī) from jala[3] respectively. It is evident[4] from the above that the jala possesses rasa, its own quality in addition to śabda, sparśa and rūpa belonging to its immediate cause viz., the tejas or fire and that the last named gross element viz., pṛthivī possesses all the five qualities viz., śabda, sparśa rūpa, rasa and gandha inherently and naturally. The fact of the qualities of cause producing similar or same qualities in the effect accepted in the Nyāyavaiśeṣika school of Indian Philosophy in particular and orthodox Indian tradition in general is aptly expressed in the saying *Kāraṇaguṇāḥ kāryaguṇān samārabhante*. Actually[1], the Brahman, in his function of having entered into or permeated the preceding ākāśa etc., creates the following vāyu etc. in the above order. We have, thus, dealt with the creation of the physical universe.

---

[1] (i) Though partless, it is an effect or manifestation (pariṇāma) like that found in the activities (e. g. infatuation, anger etc.) of the mind. Cf. बुद्धिकर्मवत् *Bhāskarabhāṣya* 2.3.7.

(ii) It is to be noted that the quality and the substance in which it inheres are non-different according to this school, hence by the creation of ākāśa etc. we should take that the qualities viz., śabda etc. respectively have also been invariably or really created. Cf. न च गुणादीनां पृथगुत्पत्तिर्वक्तव्या द्रव्योत्पत्तौ चोत्पत्तिसिद्धेस्तदनन्यत्वाद् यथा यवो जात इति यवगुणानामपि जन्मोक्तं भवति । *Bhāskarabhāṣya* 2.3.9. Also, we find, however, that the above view is quite different from that of the Nyāyavaiśeṣika. Cf. प्रथमे क्षणे निर्गुण एव घट उत्पद्यते गुणेभ्यः पूर्वंभावीति भवति गुणानां समवायिकारणम् । *Tarkabhāṣā* by Keśavamiśra, p. 33.

[2] *Bhāskarabhāṣya* 2.3.11.

[3] Ibid, 2.3.12.

[4] सर्वज्ञेन ब्रह्मणा व्यवहारार्थमेकगुणं नभो द्विगुणो वायुस्त्रिगुणोऽग्निश्चतुर्गुणं जलं पञ्चगुणा अवनिर्रचिता । Ibid, 2.2.16.

We are told that out of the traditional four kinds of bodies or organisms the *svedaja* and the *sthāvara* are not born due to the interaction of the male and female beings[2]. The triplication of the physical elements for the manifestation of so many forms (including those of these four types of bodies of the beings viz., *aṇḍaja, jarāyuja, svedaja* and *udbhij* as well as those of the inanimate objects) called by various names in the created universe is said to be done by the Supreme Being (Brahman) Himself who has re-entered or pervaded their (i. e. that of tejas, jala and pṛthivī respectively) whole existence after creating them, as the jīvas.[3]

The popular[4] orthodox view of the periodicity or cyclic order as well as the similarity of details (e. g. the order and process etc.) of creation and dissolution have been accepted in this school of Vedānta as well[5]. But dissolution does not mean total annihilation[1] of all the created universe, rather, it means that all this (e. g., the revealed Veda)[2] exists in the self-same (*svarūpaniṣṭha*) cause in its unmanifested condition or state[3] (viz, Brahman) in minute or unmanifest form[4] during that period (i. e., dissolution).

---

[1] The Brahman is spoken of as having created the tejas etc. Cf. तत्तेजोऽसृजत *Chāndogyopaniṣad* 6.2.3; स एव परमेश्वरस्तेन तेनाकाशादिरूपेण स्थित्वा तं तं विकारं सृजति । *Bhāskarabhāṣya* 2 3.13; तत्सृष्ट्वा तदेवानुप्राविशत् *Taittirīyopaniṣad* 2.6; तदात्मानं स्वयमकुरुतेति च तदभिध्यानात्तस्येश्वरस्याभिध्यानात्संकल्पादेव तत्तेज ऐक्षतेति उपचर्यते । न तेषामालोचनमस्तीत्यभिप्राय: । *Bhāskarabhāṣya* 2.3.13.

[2] योषित्पुरुषसम्बन्धमन्तरेण स्वेदजस्थावरयोर्दर्शनात् Ibid, 3.1.20.

[3] सत्प्रकरणे तेजोऽबन्नानां सृष्टिमभिधायाह । सेयं देवतैक्षत हन्ताहमिमास्तिस्रो देवता अनेन जीवेनात्मनानुप्रविश्य नामरूपे व्याकरवाणि तासां त्रिवृतमेकैकां करवाणि । (छान्दो० 6.3.28) । Ibid, 3.4.20.

[4] *Ṛgveda* 10.190.3.

[5] समानरूपत्वात् कल्पान्तरातीतैरिन्द्रादिभि: कल्पादौ सृज्यमानानां तुल्यनामरूपत्वं गम्यते दर्शनात् स्मृतेश्च । *Bhāskarabhāṣya* 1.3,30,

The order of dissolution (*upasaṁhāra*) of the universe is believed to be the reverse of that of its creation. Thus, the last in order of creation is dissolved first, and so on and so forth[5]. The inevitable supposition, as in most of the orthodox schools, is that the effect dissolves into the same material cause, out of which, it is produced or created. To make the account of creation and dissolution thoroughly appreciable and understood by the ordinary men Bhāskara describes the cyclic acts of universal creation and dissolution by the Lord (i. e., Brahman) on the analogy of the Sun spreading forth and drawing back its infinite rays everyday.[6]

(C) *The Purpose of Creation*

Not even the fools act without purpose[7]. The creative activity of the Lord (Supreme Being or Brahman), however, is due to mere sport[1]. The main practical purpose before Him is the good of the infinite beings[2] (or jīvas) which lies only in their experience (bhoga) of pleasure and pain according to their past deeds (karmans) through the vast variety of the things of the universe. The mighty Brahman is prompted by an independent desire to serve the above purpose according to His powers[3]. Thus, according to this school, the act of creation by the Supreme Being serves the purpose of the worldly usage and practical experiences as we have them.

---

[1] न हि प्रलयोऽस्माभिरत्यन्तविनाशोऽभिप्रेयते । सुषुप्त्यवस्थायामिव सूक्ष्मतापत्तिमात्रम् । Ibid, 1.3.30; Cf. सदेव सोम्येदमग्र आसीत् । *Chāndogyopaniṣad* 6.2.1.

[2] यथेदं जगदाविर्भवति पुनश्च तस्मिन्नेव प्रलयकालेऽवतिष्ठते तथा वेदोऽपि तस्मिन् ब्रह्मणि प्रतिष्ठितः सर्गादौ तदनुग्रहात् प्रजापतेर्मनसि प्रादुर्बभूव । *Bhāskarabhāṣya* 1.3.30.

[3] स एव परमेश्वरः सृष्ट्यवस्थायां प्रविभक्तनामरूपं विविधभोक्तृभोग्यं प्रपञ्चं वेद, प्रलयावस्थायां स्वात्मनि प्रलीनं अविभक्तं वेद । ibid, 2.1.14.

[4] प्रलयकालेऽपि ब्रह्मणि सूक्ष्मरूपेण वेदराशिरवस्थितः । ibid, 1.3.28.

[5] उत्पत्तिक्रमाद्विपर्ययेण प्रतिलोम्येन प्रलयक्रमो द्रष्टव्यः ibid, 2.3.14.

[6] यथा सूर्य्यः स्वरश्मीन्विक्षिप्योपसंहरति एवं प्रपञ्चानन्तभेदां शक्तिं विक्षिप्योपसंहरति परमेश्वरः । ibid, 2.1.27.

[7] Cf. the common saying प्रयोजनमनुद्दिश्य न मन्दोऽपि प्रवर्तते (also quoted in *Bhāskarabhāṣya* 2.1.32).

IV. The Rāmānuja School

(*A*) *The Concept of Causation*

According to Rāmānuja causation does not mean creation of a new substance, it means only a change of state (*avasthāpariṇāma*) according to which, a substance does not lose its identity or essentiality, but only assumes different states or modes. Before creation and after dissolution the manifold conscious (cit) and unconscious (acit or non-living) beings remain in such a subtle form that they might be treated as avyakta (unmanifest) or even non-existent. It is this non-difference in the substantiality of both the cause and the effect that has been explained in the *Chāndogyopaniṣad* by the well-known episode of Śvetaketu and Uddālaka[4]. The soul, for example, remains in subtle form while associated with God (or Brahman) during the unmanifest or causal state and can be said to become effect in its gross state the consciousness of which expands in accordance with the law of Karman and becomes explicit in and through the process of evolution[1].

---

[1] *Brahmasūtra* 2.1.33.

[2] स हि स्वेच्छया स्वात्मानं लोकहितार्थं परिणामयन् स्वशक्त्युनसारेण परिणामयति । *Bhāskarabhāṣya* 2.1.14.

[3] *Brahmasūtra* 2.1.33.

[4] *Chāndogyopaniṣad* 6.1.37,

Regarding the concept of causality Rāmānuja has also held that no non-intelligent matter, although apparently seen in some instances to work of itself, can function without the controlling influence of an intelligent principle[2]. This fact can be illustrated by such common knowledge as that of wood never forming itself into the shape of a house or conveyance without the agency of a carpenter.[3] This is the background in which we can fully appreciate the role of the Great Intelligent Person (i. e., God in the theory of creation as propounded by the Rāmānuja school.

(*B*) *God and Creation*

The individual souls (jīvas) and matter (prakṛti) are the forms or modes (*prakāras*) of God[4] (i. e., Brahman or the non-dual reality as qualified by the two) and the process of creation pertaining to them does not envisage a change in His essence (*svarūpa*). The relationship that subsists between the prakāras and God (i. e., the *prakārin*) is explained as that between a body (śarīra) and the person (śarīrin) concerned. Just as a śarīrin is found to be both the efficient and material cause of the nails and hair growing or evolving out of his śarīra, God may be accepted as both the efficient and the material cause of the universe[5].

---

1. See *Philosophy of Rāmānuja* by Dr. K. D. Bharadwaj, p. 93.
2. यत् क्षीरजलादि दृष्टान्ततया निदर्शितं तत्रापि प्राज्ञानधिष्ठाने प्रवृत्तिर्नोपपद्यते योऽप्सु तिष्ठन्नित्यादिश्रुतेः । *Śrībhāṣya* 2.2.2.
3. दार्वादेरचेतनस्य तज्ज्ञानाधिष्ठितस्य कार्यारम्भानुपपत्तेर्दर्शनाच्च न प्राज्ञानधिष्ठितं प्रधानं कारणम् । ibid, 2.2.1.
4. अतः प्रकृतिप्रकारसंस्थिते परमात्मनि प्रकारभूतप्रकृत्यंशे विकारः प्रकार्यंशे चाविकारः । *Vedārthasaṅgraha*, p. 114.
5. Mahāmahopādhyāya Gaurishankar Ojha has erroneously attributed to Rāmānuja the view that God is only the efficient cause of the universe,

The process of evolution and dissolution mainly takes place in prakṛti or nature under the supervision of God[1]. In the case of the jīvas also, there is no change as to their essence, but, the evolution (āvirbhāva) only means either contraction (saṅkoca) or expansion (vikāsa) of consciousness[2] (*caitanya*).

In this way, God is held by Rāmānuja to be both the material as well as the efficient cause of creation[3]. Creation, then, can be described, according to him, as the evolutionary change taking place in both the animate and the inanimate beings which are the modes (or characteristics) of the Personal Creator who acts as the material as well as the efficient cause.

(*C*) *The Process of Creation*

According to Rāmānuja the Supreme Person (or God), remembers at the termination of the period of dissolution (pralaya) the composition of the previous universe, wills to become manifold, and thereafter, also creates it[4]. This process of creation and dissolution goes on beginninglessly and the cycle never ends. Upon God's Will Prakṛti at its primeval unmanifest (avyakta) stage, first of all, produces the *mahattattva*[5] (the Great Principle) which produces the three-fold

---

while the jīvas are its material cause. Cf. His *Madhyakālīna Bhāratīya Saṁskṛti*, p. 97.

[1] मदीया प्रकृतिः सत्यसंकल्पेन मयाध्यक्षेणेक्षिता सचराचरं जगत् सूयते । *Gitābhāṣya*, 9.10.

[2] एवमभ्युपगच्छतामस्माकमात्मधर्मभूतस्य चैतन्यस्य स्वाभाविकस्यापि कर्मणा पारमार्थिकं संकोचं विकासं च ब्रुवताम् । *Vedārthasaṅgraha* p. 731; ज्ञानानन्दादिगुणानां कर्मणात्मनि संकुचितानां परं ज्योतिरुपसंपद्य कर्मरूपबन्धक्षये विकासरूपाविर्भावो वा नानुपपन्नः *Śrībhāṣya* 4.4.3.

[3] न निमित्तकारणमात्रं ब्रह्म उपादानकारणं च ब्रह्मैव । ibid, 1.4.21.

[4] स भगवान् पुरुषोत्तमः प्रलयावसानसमये पूर्वसंस्थानं जगत् स्मरन् बहुः स्यामिति संकल्प्य ····महदादिब्रह्माण्डान्तं हिरण्यगर्भपर्यन्तं यथापूर्वं स्मृत्वा etc. *Śrībhāṣya* 1.3.2.

[5] It has been pointed out that Rāmānuja's system believes in the existence of a 'prāṇagā Prakṛti', an intermediary condition of Prakṛti in-between its *avyakta* and *mahat* forms. Cf. *Tattvatraya* (*acitprakrarana*) by Lokācārya.

ahaṅkāra viz., sāttvika (or *vaikārika*) ahaṅkāra, rājasa (or *taijasa*) ahaṅkāra and tāmasa (or *bhūtādi*) ahaṅkāra. Next, are created the eleven organs comprising of the five organs of knowledge viz., ear, skin, eyes, tongue (as an organ of taste) and nose, the five organs of action viz., tongue (as an organ of speech), hands, feet, anus and the generative organ, and the organ of mind (or the inner sense). The process of the evolution of the gross elements originates from the bhūtādi (mentioned above). This bhūtādi produces the *śabdatanmātra*[1] from which are, likewise, produced all the following in successive order viz., the ākāśa, the *sparśatanmātra*, the vāyu, the *rūpatanmātra*, the agni, the *rasatanmātra*, the jala, the *gandhatanmātra* and the pṛthivī[2].

Then, this God (Parabrahman or Brahman) produces the cosmic egg (brahmāṇḍa) after having intermixed or triplicated the three

[1] It may be noted that the process of evolution herein differs from that of Sāṅkhyayoga school, in as much as, according to the latter, the tāmasa aspect of ahaṅkāra (called also the bhūtādi in the former) simultaneously produces the five tanmātras which in their turn respectively produce the five bhūtas. Cf. पंचभ्यः पंचभूतानि *Śāṅkhyakārikā* 22 and तस्मादपि षोडशकादपकृष्टेभ्यः पंचभ्यस्तन्मात्रेभ्यः पंचभूतान्याकाशादीनि । तत्र शब्दतन्मात्रादाकाशं शब्दगुणम् शब्दतन्मात्रसहितात् स्पर्शतन्मात्राद्वायुः शब्दस्पर्शगुणः etc. *Tattvakaumudī* on ibid The present school, however, seems to uphold the testimony of the scriptural statement regarding the creation of ākāśa alone in the beginning and afterwards that of the other bhūtas in succession (cf. *Taittirīyopaniṣad* 2.1). This also demonstrates the extreme value that its exponents attached to the Veda.

[2] राजसाहंकारसहकृताद् भूतादिसंज्ञकतामसाहंकाराच्छब्दादिपञ्चतन्मात्राण्याकाशादिपंचभूतानि चोत्पद्यन्ते इत्यादि । *Yatīndramatadīpikā* 4; भूतादिस्तु विकुर्वाणः शब्दतन्मात्रकं ततः । ससर्ज शब्दतन्मात्रादाकाशं शब्दलक्षणम् । शब्दमात्रं तथाकाशं भूतादिः स समावृणोत् । आकाशस्तु विकुर्वाणः स्पर्शमात्रं ससर्ज ह ।। बलवानभवद् वायुस्तस्य स्पर्शो गुणो मतः । आकाशं शब्दमात्रं तु स्पर्शमात्रं समावृणोत् ।। *Viṣṇupurāṇa* 1.2.37 et. seq.

elements of earth (pṛthivī), water (jala), and fire (agni)[1]. According to *Yatīndramatadīpikā*,[2] however, this triplication suggests the quintuplication (pañcīkaraṇa)[3] of the elements (bhūtas) as well.[4] One element predominates in each of the gross or conglomerated elements (*sthūlabhūtas*) and, hence, the particular names viz., that of ākāśa etc. are retained in each sthūlabhūta[5].

That the names and forms of this world are the same in every creation is a fact mentioned expressly by Bādarāyaṇa himself [6].

(D) *The Purpose of Creation*

Rāmānuja agrees with the interpretation of Śaṅkara[7] on this aspect of the theory of creation. According to his school, then, at

---

1. त्रिवृत्करणं चतुर्मुखस्याण्डान्तर्वर्तिनो न सम्भवति, त्रिवृत्कृतैः तेजोऽबन्नैर्ब्रह्माण्डमुत्पद्यते, चतुर्मुखस्य चाण्डे सम्भवः स्मर्यते तस्सिन्नण्डेऽभवद्ब्रह्मा सर्वलोकपितामह इति । अतस्त्रिवृत्करणं परस्यैव ब्रह्मणस्तत्समानकर्तृकं नामरूपव्याकरणं च तस्यैव विज्ञायते । *Śrībhāṣya* 2.4.17.
2. वेदे त्रिवृत्करणोपदेशस्तु पंचीकरणस्योपलक्षणम् । *Yatīndramatadīpikā* 4.
3. According to this well-known concept of orthodox Indian Philosophy (1) the five bhūtas in their entirety are divided into equal halves and one half of each bhūta is kept aside, (2) whereas the second half is subdivided into four parts and, (3) lastly, each of the latter i.e. 1/8 parts of a bhūta is mixed with the greater (i. e. half) part of the other four bhūtas.
4. पंचीकरणं सप्तीकरणं च पुराणप्रसिद्धम् । *Siddhāntasiddhāñjanaṁ* p. 43; इत्थं च सप्तीकरणैकदेशः पंचीकरणं तदेकदेशस्त्रिवृत्करणमिति न परस्परविरोधः ibid p. 45; इत्थं पंचीकृतैर्सप्तीकृतैर्वा तत्त्वैरण्डाद्यारम्भो देहाद्युत्पत्तिश्च ibid; द्वेधा भूतानि भित्त्वा पुनरपि च भिनत्त्यर्द्धमेकं चतुर्धा, तैरेकैकस्य भागैः परमनुकूलयत्यर्द्धमर्द्धं चतुर्भिः, इत्थं पंचीकृतैस्तैर्जनयति स जगद्धेतुरण्डादिकार्याण्यैदम्पर्यं त्रिवृत्त्वश्रुतिरधिकगिरामक्षमैका निरोद्धुम् *Tattvamuktākalāpa* 1.17.
5. वैशेष्यात्तु तद्वादस्तद्वादः । *Brahmasūtra* 2.4.19.
6. समाननामरूपत्वाच्चावृत्तावप्यविरोधो दर्शनात् स्मृतेश्च । *Brahmasūtra* 1.3.29. Cf. धाता यथापूर्वमकल्पयत् *Ṛgveda* 10.190 3.
7. सापेक्षो हीश्वरो विषमां सृष्टिं निर्मिमीते । किमपेक्षत इति चेद् धर्माधर्मावपेक्षत इति वदामः अतः सृज्यमानप्राणिधर्माधर्मापेक्षा विषमा सृष्टिरिति नायमीश्वरस्यापराधः *Śāṅkarabhāṣya* 2.1.34.

the beginning of creation God (the *Puruṣottama*) wills to become manifold out of the motive of mere sport (*līlā*) which prompts Him in the act of creation.[1] Thus, He fashions the universe by His mere will. He is busy in the affairs of the world, just as a great ruler is while arranging a game simply for his amusement. The manifold creation consists of the beings of various types viz., those of high, middle and low types. But, God is not a despot open to the charge of cruelty and partiality, because, inequalities or impurities of the created universe depend upon the deeds of the individual souls.[2]

V. The Nimbārka School

(A) The Concept fo Causation

It would not be out of place, perhaps, first of all to point out that according to this school[3] reality consists of two categories : (1) independent (svatantra) under which Brahman alone is mentioned, and (2) the dependent (partantra) which, again, is of two kinds : (a) conscious reality under which comes the individual self (jīva) alone, and (b) the non-conscious reality under which, again, come, (i) the products of the primordial cause or prakṛti, known as the *prākṛta*, (ii) the reality not pertaining to prakṛti, known as the *aprākṛta* and, (iii) time (kāla).

Nimbārka believes in satkāryavāda[4] because, even prior to creation or manifestation as well as after dissolution or extinction the effect in the form of the universe, exists in the cause i. e., the Brahman (or Lord).[5] He cites several scriptural statements to support his

---

1. अवाप्तसमस्तकामस्य परिपूर्णस्य···सर्गे लीलैव प्रयोजनम् । *Śrībhāṣya* 2.1.33.
2. सृज्यमानदेवादिक्षेत्रज्ञकर्मसापेक्षात्वाद्विषमसृष्टेः ibid. 2 1.34.
3. *Daśaślokī, verse* 3.
4. Cf. *Bhagavadgītā* 2.16.
5. *Kaustubha* 2.1.16.

above contention[1]. It is said, thus, that people desirous of producing curd, a jar, a necklace (*rucaka*) etc. definitely use milk, clay and gold as their respective material cause. This restriction in the choice of the material cause is possible only because the effect is essentially present in its cause. For example, to illustrate the reverse case, nobody has ever seen the sprouting of the barley-plant from firy particles, where the former is entirely absent[2]. Therefore, we can say that this universe is real (sat) like its own material cause, viz., God (*parameśvara*), from which it is both apparently different as well as essentially identical.[3] The universe with forms, as effect, is a modification (*pariṇāma*) of the Brahman, as cause, in which the former remains without forms, prior to creation or production.[4] However, Śrīnivāsācarya expressly mentions that this *pariṇāma* is nothing, but the potency or power of ejection belonging to the Lord, and that it cannot stand for the independent or unsupervised changes by prakṛti as in the Sāṅkhyayoga school.[5] The Nimbārka school believes in the mutual distinctness or non-identity and identity (*bhedābheda*) of the Paramātman or God with (1) individual self (jīva) and (2) the material universe (jagat).[6] However, the identity (*abheda*) with the Brahman of the conscious realities (jīvas) suggests only that their existence, activities etc.[7] are dependent on Him, and, that of the non-conscious realities, likewise, means only that these come out of Him.[1] The non-identity (or *bheda*) with the Brahman of the jīvas, is deduced from the fact that Brahman is not the doer of deeds or experiencer of the resulting pain etc., and also from the fact that He is independent, omniscient and the controller of all—while the jīvas are just the opposite.[2] Also, the non-identity of the non-conscious realities with their cause (viz., the Brahman) has been explained on the analogy of the difference in form (and not in essence) as found between the lustre of the adamantine as effect and the adamantine itself which is its cause, or on that found to exist between the waves (as effects) and the ocean (as cause of the former).[3]

---

[1] *Chāndogyopaniṣad* 6.2.1; ibid, 6.1.2, 3; ibid, 6.1.4, ibid, 6.2.3; ibid, 6.8.7; ibid, 3.14.1; *Bṛhadāraṇyakopaniṣad* 1.4.7; *Aitareyāraṇyaka* 2.4; ibid, 1.1.

[2] *Kaustubha* 2.1.17.

[3] ibid, 2.1.19.

[4] ibid, 3.2.27.

[5] See *Nimbārka School of Vedānta* by Mahāmahopādhyāya Dr. Umesha Mishra, p. 110.

[6] *Vedāntapārijātasaurabha* and *Kaustubha* on the *Daśaślokī* on *Brahmasūtra* 3.2.27; ibid, 1.2.6; ibid, 1 4.20.

[7] See the section on the role of nescience (in the form of past deeds) later on (vide p. 169).

(*B*) *God and Creation*

God possesses the following six qualities which He makes use of for creating the universe : (1) Knowledge (jñāna) through which He directly perceives everything at every place and in all the three units of time ; (2) Power (śakti) through which He makes possible what is impossible; (3) Strength (bala) with which He supports the entire universe; (4) Supremacy (*aiśvarya*) by which He controls everything; (5) Energy (*tejas*) due to which He never feels tired although there is much to cause weariness; and (6) Prowess (*vīrya*) through which He can subdue everything without Himself being suppressed.[4]

The whole universe including the intellect, the mind, the gross elements viz., the air, the fire, the water, the ether and the earth and the four types of beings viz., : the viviparous (*jarāyuja*), oviparous (*aṇḍaja*), sweat-born (*svedaja*) and those born by germinating (*udbhij*) are all ever present in the all-pervasive[1] God[2] Who is the eternal doer, Who is present in the heart of the beings as their controller, and Who is Bliss[3] (*ānanda*) and, as such, the source of ānanda to all the other jīvas.[4] Then, it is due to His ever-present nature (svabhāva)[5] that the svabhāvas of the jīvas are manifested.[6] Besides, even the various dream-cognitions for fixed durations are created[7] by God in accordance with the merits and demerits of the jīvas.[8]

---

[1] *Kaustubha* 2.1.21.

[2] *Vedāntapārijātasaurabha* and *Kaustubha* 2.1.20.

[3] *Brahmasūtra* along with *Vedāntapārijātasaurabha* and *Kaustubha* 2.1.22; ibid, 2.1.13.

[4] *Vedāntaratnamañjūṣā* pp. 44-45; *Saurabha* and *Kaustubha* 1.2.2. (See *Nimbārka School of Vedānta*, p. 30 for Eng. Trans.).

He is the source of all creation,[9] and, it is out of Him that the elements or beings (*bhūtāni*) come to exist, through Him that they have their existence and it is He in whom these retire or dissolve at the end. In other words, the objects or things of the universe

---

1. *Saurabha* 1.2.10; ibid 3.2.11,19,30; cf. also *Brahma Sūtra* 3.2.22.
2. *Vedāntaratnamañjūṣā* pp. 43-47. He is the form of all (sarvarūpa). Cf. *Kaustubha* 3.2.30.
3. *Brahma Sūtra* 1.2.15; *Saurabha* and *Kaustubha* on ibid.
4. *Saurabha* 1.1.13,15.
5. Cf. *Brahma Sūtra* 1.3.19.
6. *Saurabha* 1.3.20.
7. *Brahma Sūtra* 3.2.27 along with *Saurabha* on it.
8. *Saurabha, Kaustubha* and *Prabhā* 3.2.4-7 and *Śrutyantarasuradruma* p. 200 (referred to on p. 27 of *Nimbārka School of Vedānta*).
9. अस्याचिन्त्यविचित्रसंस्थानसम्पन्नस्यासंख्येयनामरूपादिविशेषाश्रयस्य चिदचिद्रूपस्य विश्वस्य सृष्टिस्थितिलया यस्मात् सार्वज्ञ्याद्यनन्तगुणाश्रयाद् ब्रह्मेशकालादिनियन्तुर्भगवतो भवन्ति तदेव पूर्वोक्तनिर्वचनविषयं ब्रह्म । *Saurabha* 1.1.2; सच्छब्दार्थं जगत्कारणं प्रकृत्य स्वप्नान्तं मे सोम्य विजानीहीति यत्र तत्पुरुषः स्वपिति नाम सता सोम्य तदा सम्पन्नो भवतीत्यादिनोक्तस्याप्यस्य चेतनसम्बन्धिनो ब्रह्मण्येव सम्भवात् ब्रह्मैव जगत्कारणं युक्तम् *Saurabha* 1.1.10; *Kaustubha* 1.2.14,

always remain connected[1] with the Creator during all the three states, viz., those of creation, existence and destruction.[2]

Thus, God, according to this school, is the material (upādāna) as well as the efficient (nimitta) cause of creation.[3] As such, He is said to possess a physical body of His own,[4] which is not made up of the products of the primordial matter, and He manifests in grosser form His natural potencies and their real effects in the form of conscious and unconscious entities, on the one hand (i. e., being the upādānakāraṇa) as well as connects the conscious beings (who have no knowledge of the beginningless past deeds and the dispositions caused or created by themselves) with the means of experiencing the fruits of due pleasure and pain etc. thereof (i. e. of their karmans and saṁskāras), by giving them the required amount or degree of knowledge (implying certain amount of nescience as well),[5] on the other hand (i. e., being the nimittakāraṇa).

God has infinite forms[6] which have been grouped into two categories : (1) the specific forms (*vyūhas*) which He assumes for creating the universe and for making Himself accessible to the devotees, and (2) the incarnations (*avatāras*) which He assumes for upholding the virtues and righteousness against the overwhelming onslaughts of the vices and wickedness.

---

[1] Cf. ईश्वरः सर्वभूतानां हृद्देशेऽर्जुन तिष्ठति । भ्रामयन् सर्वभूतानि यन्त्रारूढानि मायया *Bhagavadgītā* 18.61; मत्तः परतरं नान्यत् किञ्चिदस्ति धनञ्जय । मयि सर्वमिदं प्रोतं सूत्रे मणिगणा इव ॥ ibid 7.7.

[2] *Taittirīyopaniṣad* 3.1.

[3] Cf. *Brahmasūtra* along with *Saurabha* 1.4.27; ibid, 2.1.8; *Chāndogyopaniṣad* 6.2.3; ब्रह्म वनं ब्रह्म स वृक्ष आसीत् etc. in *Taittirīya Brāhmaṇa* 2.8.9.6 quoted in *Saurabha* 1.4.25; *Taittirīya Upaniṣad* 2.7; *Vedāntaratnamañjūṣā* p. 65.

[4] *Kaustubha* 1.1.2 ; Cf also *Chāndogyopaniṣad* 8.6.4 quoted in ibid; *Tattvaprakāśikā* of Keśava on *Bhagavadgītā* 4.6; *Vedāntaratnamañjūṣa* p. 72.

[5] See the section on the role of nescience later on (vide p. 169).

[6] For a detailed discussion of these see *Nimbārka School of Vedānta* pp. 38-41; Cf. *Daśaślokī* 4 and *Vedāntaratnamañjūṣā* pp. 47-49 as have been referred to in ibid.

In the former category, mention is made of (i) *Vāsudeva* or *Kṣetrajña* which is the Lord Himself in His attributeless aspect; (ii) *Saṅkarṣaṇa* or antaryāmin which is the individual self in all the beings; (iii) *Pradyumna* which is the mind (manas) in all the beings and which does not dissolve even during the universal dissolution (i. e. Pralaya), and (iv) *Aniruddha* which is manifested out of or produced from (iii) above, at the beginning of the process of creation, and which creates all the animate and the inanimate beings of the universe.

In the latter category mention is made of (i) *guṇāvatāra* which controls the three guṇas (viz., sattva, rajas and tamas) and, thus, causes the creation, continuance or existence and destruction of the universe, and in whose functioning time (kāla) which is His own form (svarūpa) also plays an important role; (ii) *Puruṣāvatāra* which is of three kinds viz. : (a) that which controls the primordial cause (i. e. prakṛti) which, evolves the Buddhi etc. and takes rest when He sleeps in the causal ocean, (b) that which is the controller of all the beings as a whole (i. e. their *samaṣṭi*), and which takes rest in the eternal interior water (*garbhoda*) and (c) that which controls the individual beings (i.e. their *vyaṣṭi*) and sleeps in the ocean of milk; and (iii) *līlāvatāra* which is of two kinds viz. : (1) *āveśāvatāra* which is, either (a) *svāṁśāveśa* i. e. that of the infusion of the Lord's own self into a physical organism made up of Prakṛti directly without having the jīva as an intervention, or (b) *śaktyaṁśāveśa* wherein the Supreme Lord infuses His potency (śakti) in varying degrees in the physical organisms having the jīvas as interventions, and (2) *svarūpāvatāra* which is of two kinds viz., (a) *aṁśarūpa* wherein the Lord present in the physical organism does not manifest His full powers, qualities et cetera, and (b) *pūrṇarūpa* wherein the Lord manifests His full powers, qualities et cetera e. g., in the incarnations of Rāma, Kṛṣṇa and Nṛsiṁha et cetera.

(*C*) *The Roles of Nescience and Unseen Force in Creation*

The manifestation of the nature (svarūpa) of māyā (or avidyā) like all other realities, is dependent on the Lord.[1] The knowledge or wisdom of jīva or the doer[2] is screened by the nescience (avidyā) or unwisdom (māyā) in the forms of its past deeds which have no beginning[3] and under whose influence the jīva has to assume,[4] a suitable body,[5] i. e., that of a god, human being or any other being who is a modification of the primordial matter (*prakṛti*) and also experience suitable sound, touch, colour, taste and odour which, too, are the modifications of the same prakṛti[6] (under the process of creation with which we shall deal later). For example, some jīvas are spoken of as assuming the bodies produced out of the watery elements present in another *bhūta* suitable for the moon region. The passage of the jīvas through the ether, air, clouds et cetera prior to the worldly birth or through the smoky path (dhūmamārga) et cetera after the worldly death as well as their passage to either the regions of the hell viz., *raurava, mahāraurava, vahni, vaitariṇī, kumbhī, tāmisra,* and *andhatāmisra* meant for the experience of pain, or to the pitṛloka et cetera—all this, too is due to the avidyā in the form of the past deeds (pūrvakarmaiis) of the jīvas. Again, we are told that the avidyā of the Lord's favourite souls whose inner senses have been purified, is duly dispelled through meditation etc. before they get liberated[1]. Thus, the role of avidyā is vital in creation.

---

[1] *Saurabha* 1.3.20.

[2] *Brahmasūtra* 2.3.32 along with *Saurabha, Kaustubha* and *Prabhā*.

[3] *Vedāntatattvabodha* p. 12; *Kaustubha* 1.3.20; Cf. *Bhagavadgītā* 5. 15.

[4] The jīva carries with it the suitable forms of all the elements viz., the earth et cetera with which its fresh body will be formed in the next region. Cf. *Kaustubha* 4.2.5.

[5] Ibid, 1.3.11-12.

[6] *Kaustubha* 1.4.10; *Vedāntaratnamañjūṣā* p. 22.

The righteous and unrighteous deeds do result in the desired and undesired experiences, but, the unseen force (adṛṣṭa) accruing from the past deeds, too, sometimes causes or leads to the performance of good or bad deeds[2], and, thus, indirectly leads to the suitable creation of body etc. for each jīva. In this manner, the doership or the principle of Karman also has a decisive and practical role in creation.

In fact, we may safely conclude that both avidyā and adṛṣṭa are rather complementary and necessary not only for the creation of the various unconscious objects of the universe but also for the mundane activities and norms of the created universe.

(D) *The Non-conscious Realities and Creation*

We have already indicated the three divisions of non-conscious or unintelligent realities[3]. Here we propose to deal with each of them as part of our study of the theory of creation according to the Nimbārka school.

(a) *Prākṛta*

The Prākṛta is the distinct creative energy (*pariṇāmiśakti*) of the Lord, but, being dependent for its activities etc. on Him, it is also, not distinct (bhinna) from Him[1]. It remains as śakti in its cause viz., the Brahman or God during the period of dissolution, and at the time of creation alone, manifests from Him (cf. the designation *brahmotpanna*) its attributes of sattva, rajas and tamas and, thereby, transforms itself into the tejas, water and food through the process of creation or modification, and finally, is responsible for the production of the distinct names and forms.[2] In this way, Prakṛti or śakti of the independent Lord plays a useful role in creation.[3] The process of the manifestation or creation from the stage of the Prakṛti which is only the unmanifest creative energy of the Lord in the form of the equilibrium of the three guṇas before the beginning of creation, shall be dealt with later on.[4]

---

[1] For a detailed discussion of the suitable regions, paths and bodies as are useful for the various kinds of jīvas after death and before next birth according to this school see *Nimbārka School of Vedānta* pp. 56-62 and pp. 77-84.

[2] *Brahmasūtra* 2.3.36 along with *Saurabha* and *Kaustubha*.

[3] See the section on the concept of causation (vide p. 163).

(*b*) *Aprākṛta*

The Aprākṛta realities[5] are not produced from either Prakṛti or its three guṇas and are beyond time (kāla).[6] These are in fact only the forms or implements viz., the bodies, the abode etc.[7] created by the Lord according to His Divine Will for the experience (bhoga) of Himself as well as of the eternally liberated beings.[8]

---

1. Cf. *Kaustubha* 1.2.21. In fact, its very dependence on the conscious God differentiates the Prakṛti here with its counterpart in the Sāṅkhyayoga school. Again, as prakṛti is the śakti of the Lord in this school its dependence on God is not like that of the non-conscious atoms in the Nyāyavaiśesika school. Cf. *Kaustubha* 1.4.9.
2. *Kaustubhaprabhā* 1.4.10.
3. *Brahmasūtra* along with *Kaustubha* 1.4.3.
4. See the section on the process of creation (vide p. 174).
5. See p. 168.
6. *Vedāntaratnamañjūṣā* p. 39.
7. Ibid.
8. *Kaustubha* 1.1.1.

(*c*) *Kāla*[1]

But, during the ordinary process of creation (i. e. in the *līlāvibhūti*) He simply imitates the dependence of kāla. In the Lord's eternal forms (*nityavibhūti*) there is no influence of Kāla. We should, therefore, judge the perspective role of Kāla in the process of creation only in the background of the fact of kāla being His own form (svarūpa). Kāla is partless, and, hence, eternal in its causal aspect, and, as such, continues to exist even during the period of dissolution. Also, it is the material cause of the notions of past, present and future etc. which are caused by it. In its above-mentioned effects, it is cognised as non-eternal. It is the instrumental cause of creation and dissolution because they take place due to its limitating or determining operation, which, however, invariably and simply consists of the actions in the form of the movements of the Sun.[2] It is interesting to note here, that, the concept of the successive cyclic order of creation and dissolution after a fixed period of time,[3] is in conformity with that of most of the orthodox schools of Indian philosophy.

Because of the overwhelming[4] importance of Kāla in the theory of creation as revealed in the orthodox schools of Indian

---

1. *Vedāntaratnamañjuṣā* p. 33; ibid pp. 38-39.
2. The time taken by the Sun to cross the space occupied by a paramāṇu is called atomic-time (one unit of time called *Paramāṇu*). Cf. the modern concepts of the light-year et cetera used in the field of space science.
3. "It is of the nature of light and non-obstruction (*anāvarakasvabhāva*); its scope, is far above that of the Primordial Matter and is also unlimited. It is known as Bliss as it manifests Bliss. It is variously called—*nityavibhūti*, Eternal Mysterious Powers of the Lord; *Paramātmaloka*, the Regions of the Paramātman; *Paramavyoma*, the Highest Heaven; *Viṣṇupada*, the Footstep of Viṣṇu; *Paramapada*, the Highest Place etc. etc." Cf. *Nimbārka School of Vedānta*, p. 92.
4. Cf. the concepts of order and periodicity as implied or explicitly accepted

philosophy in general, we give below an account of the various divisions of time, as have also been accepted in the Nimbārka School of Vedānta[1].

2 *Paramāṇus*[2] = 1 *Dvyaṇuka*,
3 *Dvyaṇukas* = 1 *Trasareṇu*,
3 *Trasareṇus* = 1 *Truṭi*,
100 *Truṭis* = 1 *Vedha*,
3 *Vedhas* = 1 *Lava*,
3 *Lavas* = 1 *Nimeṣa*,
15 *Nimeṣas* = 1 *Kāṣṭhā*,
30 *Kāṣṭhās* = 1 *Kalā*,
30 *Kalās* = 1 *Muhūrta*,
30 *Muhūrtas* = 1 *Ahorātra* (day of ours),
15 *Ahorātra* = 1 *Pakṣa* (fortnight),
2 *Pakṣas* = 1 *Māsa* (month),
2 *Māsas* = 1 *Ṛtu*,
6 *Māsas* = 1 *Ayana*,
2 *Ayanas* = 1 *Saṁvatsara* (year).

The Winter Solstice is the night of the gods, while the Summer Solstice represents the day of the gods.

The four *yugas* consist of the Divine (i. e. gods') 12 thousand years, of which the *Kṛta* covers 4800 thousand years along with the two *Sandhyās*, the *tretā* covers 3600 thousand years along with the two *Sandhyās*, the *Dvāpara* covers 2400 thousand years along with the two

---

in the different theories of creation. It is a well-known fact that Indian Literature (e.g. that of the Veda, and the śāstras like that of the jyotiṣ, the purāṇas, the kāvyas etc.) also testifies to the universal popularity of the above concepts among the masses of India.

[1] *Vedāntaratnamañjūṣā*, p. 33. The English rendering is quoted here from *Nimbārka School of Vedānta*, p. 94.

[2] See f. n. 2 on p. 172.

Sandhyās, while the *Kali* covers 1200 thousand years along with the two *Sandhyās*. The entire period represents one Cycle and such 1000 Cycles constitute One Day of the *Caturmukha*. Fourteen Manus appear one after another during the single day of the Caturmukha. Seventyone years make one *Manvantara* which is the period of existence for one Manu.

Fourteen times the above measures of time is the day of Brahmā or Caturmukha and equal to the same period is the duration of his night. One hundred years according to the above measure of time is the span of life for the Caturmukha. Half of this period of time is called *Parārdha*. The first *Parārdha* is past, and of the second *Parārdha* which is current, the present period is the first *Kalpa*, called the *Vārāhakalpa*.

(*E*) *The Process of Creation*

At the beginning of creation the equilibrium of the guṇas is disturbed by the creator God's will[1] to create the universe in accordance with the adṛṣṭa of the jīvas.[2] Then, the unmanifest eternal primordial matter (*Prakṛti*) gets manifested or modified into the non-eternal products (vyaktas)[3] in the following order.[4] Mahat (the great principle) is created first of all and it produces egoism (ahaṅkāra), the latter being of three kinds due to the predominance of one of the three guṇas in each case. The sāttvika or *vaikārika* aspect of ahaṅkāra produces or manifests the presiding deities of the five sense-organs and the mind (manas). From rājasika or *taijasa* ahaṅkāra are manifested the ten external-organs (i. e. both those of sense i. e., the *jñānendriyas* and those of action i. e. the *karmendriyas*). From the tāmasika or *bhūtādi* aspect of ahaṅkāra the following are produced in successive order viz., śabdatanmātra, ākāśa, sparśatanmātra, vāyu, rūpatanmātra, tejas, rasatanmātra, jala, gandhatanmātra and pṛthvī. The tanmātras, as we well know, are the subtle elements and the ākāśa etc. are the gross elements (*Bhūtas*).[1] Thus, pṛthvī has got all the five qualities, jala has only four, tejas has only three, vāyu has only two, while ākāśa has got only one quality as follows from the traditional recognition of the concept that the quality of a cause (e. g., that of śabda or sound in the śabdatanmātra) is universally present in the effect (e. g., in the vāyu in the above case). By the way, we may mention that the traditional constitution of the subtle body (*sūkṣma-śarīra*)[2] by the seventeen of these products viz., by the 5 tanmātras, manas, the 10 indriyas, and prāṇa (which never leaves the jīva in the worldly state of bondage and together with which the jīva migrates from one gross body to another) is duly accepted by this school also. The non-eternal[3] gross body (*sthūlaśarīra*) is, also, likewise, accepted to have been materially caused or produced by the Prakṛti, mahat, ahaṅkāra and the 5 bhūtas. These sthūlaśarīras are produced as a result of the karmans in the case of the traditional four kinds viz., the jarāyuja etc., as well as, not as due to them (i. e. karmans) in the case of the bodies (e. g., the one called *virāṭ* etc.) as are assumed by the Lord.

---

[1] *Taittirīya Upaniṣad* 2.6; *Chāndogyopaniṣad* 6.2.3.

[2] *Vedāntaratnamañjūṣā* pp. 23-24.

[3] *Kaustubha* 1.1.1.

[4] *Vedāntaratnamañjūṣa* (pp. 24-31) gives a very lucid and detailed exposition about all the products of prakṛti (as are being mentioned here) according to this school.

---

[1] The implied acceptance of the process of quintuplication (cf *Nimbārka School of Vedānta*, p. 109) does not, however, appear to be supported by the above description, for, although the tanmātras and the bhūtas are distinguished, the latter are individually produced from the former and even *vice versa* in some cases. This manner eventually appears as quite confusing and, surely, not in conformity with similar tradition of any other orthodox school of Indian Philosophy.

[2] The concept of sūkṣmaśarīra according to the Vedānta, as is being mentioned here, may be compared with that of the Sāṅkhyayoga school, wherein, however, it is regarded to be composed of 18 principles viz., buddhi, ahaṅkāra, the 11 indriyas and the 5 tanmātras.

[3] We have referred to the creation of the Aprākṛta bodies etc. of the Lord and the eternally liberated beings on p. 171 earlier.

The order of dissolution is just the reverse[1] of that of creation except, that it, too, starts and functions under the Lord's will[2] and causality like the latter does. Thus, the pṛthvī dissolves into the gandhatanmātra and so on and so forth, till all the products of the Prakṛti finally dissolve into it. During the period of dissolution the Prakṛti, in the form of śakti, remains in Brahman (or God) which is its cause, and, being unmanifest, it is incapable of differentiating between the name and the form which are characteristics of its manifest or productive state.[3]

(F) *The Purpose of Creation*

As all His desires have been fulfilled, the Lord has no more desire for anything.[4] But, since we have seen how creation and dissolution (and, in fact, all the activities of the universe for that matter) are dependent upon His independent Will, the theory of creation reasonably requires there being some purpose or motivation behind

---

[1] *Vedāntaratnamañjūṣa* pp. 36-37.

[2] *Kaustubha* 1.2.9.

[3] *Prabhā* 1.4.10.

[4] *Kaustubha* 1.2.11; Cf. न मे पार्थास्ति कर्तव्यं त्रिषु लोकेषु किञ्चन । नानवाप्तमवाप्तव्यं वर्त एव च कर्मणि ।। यदि ह्यहं न वर्तेयं जातु कर्मण्यतन्द्रितः । मम वर्त्मानुवर्तन्ते मनुष्याः पार्थ सर्वशः ।। उत्सीदेयुरिमे लोका न कुर्यां कर्म चेदहम् । सङ्करस्य च कर्ता स्यामुपहन्यामिमाः प्रजाः ।। *Bhagavadgītā* 3.22-24.

His spontaneous[1] and sweet Will.[2] Thus, it is said that He creates the universe only for the purpose of playful activity (*līlā*) and, hence, injustice and cruelty in respect of the unhappiness etc. found in the created universe, also, cannot be ascribed to Him.[3] Besides, as we have already seen, He helps the jīvas to have the experience of pleasure and pain in accordance with their past deeds through the act of creation, and, as the avidyā pertaining to the jīvas in the form of the past deeds is endless, there never would be any lack of them (i. e., that of the past deeds) according to which he may create the universe comprising suitable[4] (1) objects (e. g., food and drink) qualified by the qualities of sound, touch etc.; (2) the implements of bhoga viz., the body, the sense-organs, and the mind etc.; and (3) the place of bhoga viz., the entire universe (brahmāṇḍa)[5] of the 14 regions.[6]

VI. The Mādhva School

(A) The Concept of Causation

Mādhva concept of causation can be described as both[7] satkāryavāda and asatkāryavāda. The absolute non-existence of the effect in the cause, according to the latter case, may lead us even to propound that anything[1] can be produced out of nothing; while in the former case, the fact of the effect being ever existent, though, in a nascent form, in the cause prior to its manifestation, may also lead to conceive anything as capable of being produced from anything without any limitations, whatsoever, regarding its nature. In this background, we may appreciate the concept of causation according to the Mādhva philosopher.

---

[1] All the qualities of the Lord (including the Will, of course) are natural. Cf. *Vedāntaratnamañjūṣā* pp. 18-19.

[2] *Brahmasūtra* 2.1.24 along with *Saurabha, Kaustubha* and *Prabhā.*

[3] *Brahmasūtra* 2.1.31-33 along with *Saurabha.*

[4] *Vedāntaratnamañjūṣā* p. 31.

[5] For the orthodox Indian concept of the brahmāṇḍa see *Viṣṇupurāṇa* 2.3.

[6] According to the orthodox Indians these consist of (1) the region of भू: (i.e. our earth), (2) the higher regions viz., those of भुव:, स्व:, मह:, जन:, तप: and सत्यम् as well as (3) the lower ones viz., those of अतल, वितल, सुतल, तलातल, रसातल, महातल and पाताल ।

[7] According to Padmanābhasūri the Mādhva concept of causation is a middle path between those of the Nyāyavaiśeṣika and the Sāṅkhyayoga schools. (Cf. *Mādhvasiddhāntasāra*).

Prior to production, the effect exists in the form of the cause and it is non-existent as an effect, and after its creation, the effect exists in its own form and is non-existent as cause. The two are, therefore, only different aspects of the same principle of material causality and neither asatkāryavāda nor satkāryavāda by themselves, but, both taken together, are applicable in the concept of causation.

The cause which (being an unconditional and invariable antecedent)[2] undergoes a real transformation or modification[3] (pariṇāma) of either quality (i. e. the *dharma*)[4] or the qualified (i. e. the *dharmin*)[5] is known as the material cause. The universe, too, as an effect, is created from the unconscious primordial matter (Prakṛti) rather than Brahman, as the material cause. Thus, it is held that the Prakṛti or Pradhāna forms the body of the Lord or God, which actually evolves as the created world, and, into which at the time of dissolution the various evolutes dissolve.[6]

---

1. अत्यन्तासत: शशशृङ्गादेरपि उत्पत्तिप्रसङ्गात् *Mādhvasiddhāntasāra* pp. 93-94.
2. अनन्यथासिद्धत्वे मति कार्यनियतपूर्ववृत्ति कारणम् *Pramāṇacandrikā* p. 138; कार्यं प्रागभावप्रतियोगि *Tarkasaṅgraha* by Annambhaṭṭa, p. 44.
3. परिणामि कारणं हि उपादानमुच्यते *Nyāyasudhā* by Jayatīrtha p. 194.
4. e. g. the transformation in the colour of the mango.
5. e g. the transformation of milk into curd.
6. *Nyāyasudhā* p. 197.

The instrumental cause, on the other hand, does not create or produce its effect through a process of self-modification, but through its activity.[1] In every creation there is also a conscious instrumental cause acting as the real force behind all the activities of the other instrumental causes. The activity of the potter's stick,[2] as instrumental cause, in the production of the jar, for example, is impossible without the conative activity of the potter. It is in this background, that, the role of a willing God in the creation of the universe may be considered as very significant.

(*B*) *The Process of Creation And the Role of God in It*

The instrumental causality of God (or Brahman) in respect of the created universe is like that of a father in respect of his son.[3] His desire for procreation finds ample descritption in the Upaniṣads.[4] The Prakṛti forms His body and as such a desire in Him may understandably change or disturb the original state or that of equilibrium of the former, and cause the creation of the world-order. In fact, in our actual experience, the desire of a conscious individual, e. g., that of a human being, is found capable of effecting physiological changes in the form of responses. The relationship between the Lord's desire and Prakṛti is, thus, rendered fully intelligible on the analogy of a soul (jīva) and his body.

---

1. *Tattvaprakāśikā* p. 8.
2. Unseen or moral force has been held to be such an additional instrumental cause in the creation of the universe according to the *Pramāṇacandrikā* (cf. *An Outline of Mādhva Philosophy*, p. 73).
3. *Tattvaprakāśikā* p. 8; cf. the mantra यो नः पिता जनिता यो विधाता धामानि वेद भुवनानि विश्वा quoted in *Brahmasūtrabhāṣya* p. 6.
4. *Chāndogyopaniṣad* 6.2.3.

Then, we are told that everything (i. e. both conscious and unconscious beings)[1] in this universe, as presently found in its created state, ultimately depends[2] on God Who is the cause or sole controller of its creation, sustenance and destruction,[3] being omniscient, omnipotent and possessed of unobstructed Will.[4] But, this dependence of everything on God, according to the school's theory of theistic realism, however, is quite different from the theory of Brahman being the substrate of the world-appearance as interpreted by the Śaṅkara school.[5] It is in this respect that Madhva even holds the Lord as

---

1. न हि जीवप्रकृतिभ्यामीश्वरस्यार्थः *Bhāgavata Tātparya* 2.9.31.
2. There are two forms of reality according to this school viz , the independent (svatantra) and the dependent (paratantra). Cf. स्वतन्त्रमस्वतन्त्रञ्च द्विविधं तत्त्वमिष्यते । स्वतन्त्रो भगवान्विष्णुः *Tattvasaṅkhyāna* p. 1 and द्विविधं हि प्रमेयं स्वतन्त्रं परतन्त्रं च । *Nyāyasudhā* p. 286 (cf. द्रव्यं कर्म च कालश्च स्वभावो जीव एव च । यदनुग्रहतः सन्ति न सन्ति यदुपेक्षया ।। *Bhāgavata* 2.10.12; ibid 1.5.20); dependence is interpreted so as to mean the dependence of a substance on another in respect of existence, knowledge and activity (cf. commentary by Jayatīrtha on *Tattvasaṅkhyāna*). 'The universe thus depends on God as its ground and *ratio essendi*, but not as cause in the narrow sense of the term: अधिष्ठानमिति प्राहुर्मूलाधारं विचक्षणाः । यत्स्थितं दृश्यते वस्तु संस्थानं तदुदीरितम् । उभयं हरिरेवास्य मुनिपुङ्गव *Vāmanapurāṇa* quoted in *Bhāgavata Tātparya* p. 13.' See *Philosophy of Śrī Madhvācārya* p. 152; also cf. शृणुतामलसत्यवचः परमं शपथेरितमुच्छ्रितबाहुयुगम् । न हरेः परमो न हरेः सदृशः परमः स तु सर्वचिदात्मगणात् ।। *Dvādaśastotra* by Madhvācārya quoted in *Śrī Madhwa, his life and doctrine* p. 159.
3. *Brahmasūtrabhāṣya* 1.1.2.
4. *Karmanirṇayaṭīkā* by Jayatīrtha p. 4 b (referred to in *Philosophy of Śrī Madhvācārya* p. 151).
5. सर्वाण्यपि हि वेदान्तवाक्यानि असङ्ख्येयकल्याणगुणाकरं सकलदोषगन्धविधुरं एकरूपमेव परं ब्रह्म ··प्रतिपादयन्ति । किन्तु (1) कानिचित् सर्वज्ञत्वसर्वेश्वरत्वसर्वान्तर्यामित्वसौन्दर्यौदार्यादिगुणविशिष्टतया (2) कानिचित् अपहतपाप्मत्वनिर्दुःखत्वभौतिकदेहरहितत्वादिदोषाभावविशिष्टतया

the non-dual (advaya) and sole reality.[1] In fact, the theory of creation according to this school merely extolls and reminds, however inadequately though, of the majesty of God Whose action causes the actualisation or manifestation of what is unmanifest in or 'yet-in-the-womb of' matter and in the souls.[2]

(C) *Māyā and Creation*

According[3] to the Mādhva school of Vedānta the term māyā suggests alternately (1) the independent desire[4] and omnipotence of God, (2) unconscious primordial matter (jaḍa prakṛti)[5] which is the material cause of this universe, as we have seen above, and (3) ignorance (ajñāna) which is responsible for the jīvas' deception[6]. It is clear from the above, that, māyā has been conceived here as the supra-rational or mysterious power of God, being His mental capacity for the creation of the universe. Besides, this very latent creative power (śakti) has to undergo manifestation or patency (vyakti) at the time of creation[1].

---

(3) कानिचिदतिगहनताज्ञापनाय अवाङ्मनोगोचरत्वाकारेण (4) कानिचित् सर्वपरित्यागेन तस्यैवोपादानायाद्वितीयत्वेन (5) कानिचित् मर्वसत्ताप्रतीतिप्रवृत्तिनिमित्तताप्रतिपत्त्यर्थं सर्वात्मकत्वेन इत्येवमाद्यनेकप्रकारैः परमपुरुषं वोधयन्ति । ततो व्याकुलवुद्धयो गुरुसम्प्रदायविकलाः सर्वप्राप्यैकरूपताम्ननुसन्दधाना वेदं छिन्दन्ति । *Nyāyasudhā* p. 123.

1. पारमार्थिकसत्यत्वं स्वातन्त्र्यमभिधीयते । तद्विष्णोरेव नान्यस्य तदन्येषां सदास्तिता ॥ *Bhāgavata Tātparya* 11.24.1; यदधीना यस्य सत्ता तत्तदित्येव भण्यते । विद्यमाने विभेदेऽपि मिथो नित्यं स्वरूपतः ibid 2.5.2; न हि तदधीनं पृथगित्येवोच्यते *Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad* 4 4.14; Cf. अद्वैतं परमार्थतः *Māṇḍūkya Upaniṣad* 1.17.
2. सृष्टिश्च प्राधान्यार्थमत्रोच्यते *Chāndogyopaniṣad Bhāṣya* 6.1; अपुरुपार्थत्वान्न प्रपञ्चसत्यतायां तात्पर्यमिति चेन्न (cf. *Śāṅkarabhāṣya* 1.4.14); मत्यजगन्निर्मातृत्वादिपरमेश्वरमहामहिमज्ञापनस्यैव परमपुरुपार्थत्वात् *Nyāyasudhā* p. 200; Cf. भीपास्माद्वातः पवते भीपोदेति सूर्यः *Taittirīya Upaniṣad* 2.8.
3. *Yuktimallikā*, verses 2.321-331.
4. नमो मायामयाय च *Rāmapūrvatāpanīyopaniṣad*; अस्मान्मायी सृजते विश्वमेतत् *Śvetāśvataropaniṣad* 4.9.
5. *Svetāśvataropaniṣad* 4.10; *Cūlikopaniṣad* 3.
6. अनादिमायया सुप्तो यदा जीवः प्रबुद्ध्यते *Māṇḍūkyakārikā* 1.16; माययापहृतज्ञानाः *Bhagavadgītā* 7.15; भ्रामयन्सर्वभूतानि यन्त्रारूढानि मायया *Bhagavadgītā* 18.61.

We may as well conclude, that creation is a real or metaphysical fact (like God Himself)[2], originating out of the material causality of Prakṛti (or māyā) subservient to the Will of the Lord.

(*D*) *The External Realities and Creation*

The acquiring of a new trait or quality[3] that depends on the will of the independent Super-soul (i. e. God), has got to be accepted also[1] in the case of the eternal realities or substances like time, space, matter, souls and the Veda which are never created in the sense that they always exist in their subtle, unmanifest or uncreated state even

---

1. अनित्यत्वात्क्रियाणां तु कुत एव स्वरूपता इति चेत्स विशेषोऽपि क्रियाशक्त्यात्मना स्थितः । शक्तिता व्यक्तिता चेति विशेषोऽपि विशेषवान् । *Anuvyākhyāna* ..2.
2. किञ्च यदि जगत्कल्पितं स्यात् तदा त्वन्मतेऽपि (1) जन्माद्यस्य इति सूत्रे यतो वेत्यादिश्रुतौ च जन्माद्युक्तिः (2) ईक्षतेर्नाशब्दमिति सूत्रे तदैक्षत इतीश्वरस्येक्षापूर्वककर्तृत्वोक्तिः (3) लोकवत्तु इति सूत्रे आप्तकामस्य च प्रयोजनाभावेऽपि लीलया सृष्ट्याद्युक्तिः (4) वैषम्यनैर्घृण्येनेति सूत्रे कर्मसापेक्षत्वेनावैषम्योक्तिः (5) तेज आदेर्वाय्वादिजन्मोक्तिः (6) पृथ्व्यादिलयोक्तिरित्याद्युक्तं स्यात् । न हि कल्पितस्य जन्मादिकमीक्षापूर्वकं स्रष्टृत्व वा तद्भ्रान्तेः प्रयोजनापेक्षा वा । *Nyāyamṛta* by Vyāsatīrtha p. 246.
3. See the section on the concept of causation (vide p. 178) earlier.
4. नन्वेतदयुक्तम् नित्यस्य पराधीनतासम्भवादित्यत आह 'नित्यमिति' । यथा अनित्यं घटादिकमनित्यतया नियम्यते तथा नित्यमपि नित्यात्मना नित्यं सर्वदैवेश्वरो नियामयति । यथा हि घटादयोऽनित्यस्वभावा अपि नाकस्मादनित्या भवन्ति । तथात्वे चोत्पत्त्युत्तरक्षण एव विनाशसम्भवात् । एवं नित्यस्यापि नित्यता यदि पराधीना तदा को दोषः । न चानित्यता पराधीनेति कदाचिन्नित्यता घटादेः प्राप्ता विनाशकारणोपनिपातध्रौव्यात् । तथा नित्यस्य नित्यतायाः पराधीनत्वेऽपि न जात्वनित्यताप्राप्तिः । *Nyāyasudhā*, p. 330.

before the creation takes place.[1] Thus, creation does take place only in respect of a new trait (*dharma*) in them and not in respect to the latter's substratum.[2]

(*E*) *The Individual Souls and Creation*

It may be interesting, now, to deal with the souls[3] (jīvas) from the viewpoint of the Mādhva theory of creation as discussed in the preceding section. We know that the individual jīvas are different from God and also from the inanimate objects of the material (prākṛta) universe as well as from each other, among themselves. The conditions or limitations like the birth etc. (i. e. the *upādhis*)[4] ascribed[5] to them in the course of their creation or origination (utpatti)[1] are only the distinguishing rather than any sort of creative characteristics, which give a qualified[2] appearance to the eternal and beginningless jīvas.[3]

---

[1] Cf. f.n. 1 and also *Tattvasaṅkhyāna* and its commentary as referred to in *Philosophy of Śrī Madhvācārya*, p. 156.

[2] See *Philosophy of Śrī Madhvācārya* pp. 159-161 for a lucid and detailed discussion of the concept of *apūrvaviśeṣopajanana*, *parādhīnasvarūpāntarāpatti* or *parādhīnaviśeṣāptirūpasṛṣṭi* in respect of the nitya padārthas; cf. also अपूर्वविशेषोपजनने हि विशिष्टाकारोपजनोऽवश्यम्भावी । विशिष्टाकारश्च वस्तुस्वरूपाभिन्न इति तस्यैवासावुपजनो भवति । *Nyāyasudhā* p. 431 referred to in ibid; नैव किञ्चित्ततो जन्मवर्जितं परमादृते ।। पराधीनविशेषत्वे जन्मनः स्थूलताभवः । पूर्वशब्दविलोपश्च यदि जन्मेति कीर्त्यते । रमाया नैव जन्माप्तिः चैतन्यस्यापि केवलम् । प्रधानस्य च वेदस्य···।। *Anuvyākhyāna* 2.3.

[3] Like Rāmānuja, Madhva, too, believes in their atomic dimension (Saṇu pariṇāma). Cf. अणुर्ह्येषात्मायं वा येऽते सिनीत पुण्यं चापुण्यं चेति गोपवनश्रुतो अणुत्वमित्यतोऽविरोध इति । *Brahmasūtrabhāṣya* p. 84; *Brahmasūtra* 2.3.19; *Tattvaprakāśikā* p. 115; *Praśnopaniṣad* 3.6; *Muṇḍopaniṣad* 3.1.9; *Kauśītakyupaniṣad* 3.3; *Bṛhadāraṇyakopaniṣad* 4.4.6.

[4] जीवोपाधिर्द्विधा प्रोक्तः स्वरूपं बाह्य एव च । बाह्योपाधिर्लयं याति मुक्तो अन्यस्य तु स्थितिः ···तथा उपाधेश्च नित्यत्वात् नैव जीवो विनश्यति । स्वरूपत्वादुपाधेश्च न भिन्नोपाधिकल्पनम् *Tattvaprakāśikā* p 119.

[5] Cf. the significance of the concept of upādhi (i.e the conditioning factor) due to māyā in the Śāṅkara school of Vedānta

(*F*) *The Periodicity of Creation*

After being created by God the universe subsists for a period which is one-eighth of that of dissolution (laya).[4] This shows, that, this school, too, believes in the orthodox view regarding the fixed duration and successive order of creation (sṛṣṭi) and dissolution. The ratio of one and one-eighth between their respective periods, as against the normal concept[5] (e. g. that in the Nyāyavaiśeṣika school or the purāṇas etc.) of equality in that regard, is noteworthy. However, this difference is not very substantial or material in the general Indian viewpoint.

(*G*) *The Purpose of Creation*

Although, God has no desires unifulfilled being omnipotent, yet He creates this universe in His sportive mood. His desire for creation has been compared to the activity of a person who in his hilarious mood dances and sings.[6] The event of universal creation, thus, is a

---

1. जीवोऽप्यत एव परमेश्वरादुत्पद्यते···नित्यस्यापि हि जीवस्योपाध्यपेक्षया उत्पत्तिर्युज्यते *Brahmasūtrabhāṣya* p. 83.
2. वलमानन्द ओजश्च सहो ज्ञानमनाकुलम् । स्वरूपाण्येव जीवस्य व्यज्यन्ते परमाद्विभोः *Brahmasūtrabhāṣya* 2.3.31; प्रकृतावनुप्रविश्य तां परिणाम्य तत्परिणामनियामकतया तत्र आत्मनो बहुधाकरणात् ibid, 1.4.27.
3. *Tattvaprakāśikā* p. 115.
4. लयस्य त्वष्टमो भागः सृष्टिकाल उदाहृतः । तत्रैव वेदसञ्चारोऽन्यदा स्तुतिमात्रकाः । *Bhāgavata Tātparya* p. 71b (quoted in *Philosophy of Śrī Madhvācārya* p. 164).
5. Cf. आब्रह्मभुवनाल्लोकाः पुनरावर्तिनोऽर्जुन । मामुपेत्य तु कौन्तेय पुनर्जन्म न विद्यते ॥ सहस्रयुगपर्यन्तमहर्यद्ब्रह्मणो विदुः । रात्रिं युगसहस्रान्तां तेऽहोरात्रविदो जनाः ॥ अव्यक्ताद् व्यक्तयः सर्वाः प्रभवन्त्यहरागमे । रात्र्यागमे प्रलीयन्ते तत्रैवाव्यक्तसंज्ञके ॥ भूतग्रामः स एवायं भूत्वा भूत्वा प्रलीयते । रात्र्यागमेऽवशः पार्थ प्रभवत्यहरागमे ॥ *Bhagavadgītā* 8.16-19.
6. *Brahmasūtrabhāṣya* 2.1.33; सृष्ट्यादिकं हरिर्नैव प्रयोजनमपेक्ष्य तु । कुरुते केवलानन्दाद् यथा मत्तस्य नर्तनम् ॥ *Yuktimallikā* by Vādirāja p. 442.

metaphysical[1] fact happening at a time when God wills it out of His nature (svabhāva)[2] being overwhelmed with the feeling of promoting the good of the jīvas.

VII. The Vāllabha School

(*A*) *The Concept of Causation*

The Vāllabha school of Vedānta believes in the doctrine of the concealment of consciousness and bliss in the universe which is created by the will of Brahman through the process of appearance (āvirbhāva) and by disappearance (tirobhāva) based upon that concealment.[3] This concept of causation is known as Brahmavāda. Creation, therefore, means the manifestation (āvirbhāva)[4] of the Brahman in the form of the innumerable souls (jīvas) with its attribute of bliss obscured, and that in the form of the unconscious beings (i. e. inert matter) with its attributes of consciousness and bliss obscured. There being no change (vikāra) in the real nature of Brahman even after creation, the essential unity or immutability of Brahman is not modified by the concept of causation.[1] In other words, although, the Brahman or ultimate reality having innumerable forms of the above two categories, is 'changing', from the viewpoint of creation, it is not essentially modified or transformed from the viewpoint of identity between the cause and the effect[2] or that of the non-dualism of the Brahman.[3] This non-dualism[4] (advaita) between the effect (i. e. the created universe) and its cause (viz., Brahman) is without the touch of unreality or illusoriness (māyā),[5] and, hence, known as pure (śuddha).[6] The effect (e. g. the jar) is real in so far as it is the earth (i. e. essentially one with its material cause) and in this sense alone, the former can be described as a mere name produced by speech according to Vallabhācārya.[7] The concept of causation, therefore, according to his school, holds the universe (or creation) to be identical with Brahman (or God), and, hence, real.[8] The created universe or diversity of effects, cannot be non-existent or unreal[9] for we actually perceive it.[10] The

---

[1] The falsity of the created or 'matter-of-fact' universe from the transcendental or absolute idealistic viewpoint, on account of its being perceived, has been demonstrated as illogical and falacious by the Mādhva school. Cf. *An Outline of Mādhva Philosophy* by Dr K. Narain, pp. 128-138.

[2] ननु शक्तस्यापि परमेश्वरस्य तन्नियमानुसरणेच्छा कुतः इति चेत् किं कारणं पृच्छसि उत ज्ञापकम् ? आद्ये स्वभावमिति ब्रूम । द्वितीये श्रुतिप्रसिद्धेरिति । *Nyāyasudhā* p. 289.

[3] *Aṇubhāṣya* by Vallabhācārya 2.1.4; cf ibid 2.1.6 where the created universe is referred to as possessed of consciousness, which, is the nature of its inherent cause viz., Brahman.

[4] Cf. तस्य ह वा एतस्यैवं पश्यत एवं मन्वानस्यैवं विजानत आत्मनः, प्राण आत्मत आशात्मतः स्मर आत्मत आकाश आत्मनस्तेज आत्मत आप आत्मत आविर्भावतिरोभावावात्मतोऽन्नमात्मतो बलमात्मतो विज्ञानमात्मतो ध्यानमात्मतश्चित्तमात्मतः सङ्कल्प आत्मतो मन आत्मतो वागात्मतो नामात्मतो मन्त्रा आत्मतः कर्मण्यात्मत एवेदं सर्वमिति ॥ *Chāndogyopaniṣad* 7.26.1.

---

1. तथा च अस्थूलादिगुणयुक्त एव अविक्रियमाण एव आत्मानं करोतीति वेदान्तार्थः सङ्गतो भवति *Aṇubhāṣya* 1.1.3; तदात्मानं स्वयमकुरुत इति स्वस्यैव कर्मकर्तृभावात् अविकृतमेव सुवर्णम् । सर्वाणि च तैजसानि । Ibid, 1.4.26.
2. *Aṇubhāṣya* 2.1.14; *Chāndogyopaniṣad* 6.1.4.
3. *Tattvadīpanibandha* by Vallabha 1.65-72.
4. *Chāndogyopaniṣad* 6.1.4; *Brahmasūtra* 2.1.14.
5. *Aṇubhāṣya* 2.1.14; Ibid, 2.2 26; cf. *Brahmasūtra Śāṅkarabhāṣya* 2.1.19 which compares the appearance of the universe from Brahman with the phenomenon of 'becoming spread out' of a piece of folded cloth.
6. मायासम्बन्धरहितं शुद्धमित्युच्यते बुधैः । कार्यकारणरूपं हि शुद्धं ब्रह्म न मायिकम् ॥ *Śuddhadvaitamārtaṇḍa* 28.
7. *Aṇubhāṣya* 2.1.14.
8. सर्वं खल्विदं ब्रह्म *Chāndogyopaniṣad* 3.14.1; भावे च उपलब्धेः *Brahmasūtra* 2.1.15; सत्त्वाच्च अवरस्य *Brahmasūtra* 2.1.16.
9. Cf. असत्यमप्रतिष्ठं ते जगदाहुरनीश्वरम् ।
   अपरस्परसम्भूतं किमन्यत्कामहैतुकम् ॥ *Bhagavadgītā* 16 8.
10. नाभाव उपलब्धेः *Brahmasūtra* 2.2.28; यस्तूपलभमान एव नाहमुपलभ इति वदति स कथमुपा-

created universe has a practical reality and is illusory in nature like the dream.[1]

We may, therefore, conclude that the concept of causation according to this school, aptly given the name of *avikṛtapariṇāmavāda*[2] by Vallabhācārya himself believes that the Brahman is both the efficient and material cause of creation[3] and that as the cause is real[4] the effect, too, must be held as real because there is no material difference between cause and effect.[5]

(*B*) *Brahman*[6] *and the Process of Creation*

We have seen how the pure Brahman, untainted by māyā, can create the universe according to the concept of causation in the Vāllabha school of Vedānta.

Just as the Sun is not different from the light it emits, because, the two are residing in one and the same place, are related by the

---

देयवचनः स्यात् ।। *Aṇubhāṣya* on ibid; यदप्युच्यते बाह्यार्थव्यतिरेकेणापि वासनया ज्ञानवैचित्र्यं भविष्यतीति तन्न । वासनानां न भाव उपपद्यते । त्वन्मते बाह्यार्थस्यानुपलब्धेः । उपलब्धस्य हि वासनाजनकत्वम् अनादित्वे त्वन्धपरम्परान्यायेनाप्रति अर्थव्यतिरेकेण वासनाया अभावाद् वासनाव्यतिरेकेणाप्यर्थोपलब्धेरन्वयव्यतिरेकाभ्यामुभयार्थासिद्धिः । *Aṇubhāṣya* 2.2.30.

[1] वैधर्म्याच्च न स्वप्नादिवत् *Brahmasūtra* 2.2.29 and *Aṇubhāṣya* on ibid.

[2] See *An Introduction to Śuddhādvaita School of Philosophy of Śrī Vallabhācārya*, pp. 122-123.

[3] Brahman is defined as the one from which the world has its orignation, sustenance and absorption. Cf. *Brahmasūtra* 1.1.2, 3; Cf. *Chāndogyopaniṣad* 6.1.3 et. seq.; प्रकृतिश्च प्रतिज्ञादृष्टान्तानुरोधात् *Brahmasūtra* 1.4.23; *Aṇubhāṣya* 1.1.3; जगतः समवायि स्यात्तदेव च निमित्तकम् *Tattvadīpanibandha* 1.6.8; Cf. also तदात्मानं स्वयमकुरुत·· तस्मात्सुकृतमुच्यते । *Taittirīya Upaniṣad* 2.7.

[4] नासतोऽदृष्टत्वात *Brahmasūtra* 2.2.27; Cf. ibid, 2.2.26 with *Aṇubhāṣya* on it.

[5] *Brahmasūtra* 2 1.14; कार्यस्य कारणानन्यत्वं न मिथ्यात्वम् *Aṇubhāṣya* on ibid; Cf. *Chāndogyopaniṣad* 6.1.4,

[6] यज्ञरूपो हरिः पूर्वकाण्डे ब्रह्मतनुः परे । अवतारी हरिः कृष्णः श्रीभागवत ईर्यते ।। *Tattvadīpanibandha* 1.11.

relation of inherence or intimate union, and also, because the former remains the substratum of the latter while continuing to be in his own original form all the same[1]—even so the Lord remains in His attributes as their support so that there is no destruction of His own essential form or personality.[2] Thus, the above qualities of Brahman are identical with Him.[3] But, just as the light of the Sun is not Sun himself, because, we perceive them as two distinct things, the qualities of Brahman must necessarily be admitted as having different identity, and, therefore, we may conclude that the Brahman and its qualities are both identical as well as non, identical from the viewpoint of creation or production (utpatti).[4] According to Vallabhācārya, the dual[5] and the non-dual aspects are both suggested in the Brahman by the scripture (śruti) in different types of statements,[6] and the Vedāntaśāstra is meant to reconcile

---

1. *Aṇubhāṣya* 3 2.28.
2. *Tattavdīpanibandhaprakāśa* 1.66.
3. *Chāndogyopaniṣad* 6.2.1.
4. *Aṇubhāṣya* 3.2.28-29.
5. *Chāndogyopaniṣad* 3.14.2; *Śvetāśvataropaniṣad* 6.8 etc.; Bādarāyaṇa admits these contradictory attributes in Brahman. Cf. सर्वोपेता च तद्दर्शनात् *Brahmasūtra* 2.1 30; सर्वधर्मोपपत्तेश्च ibid, 2.1.37; आत्मनि चैवं विचित्राश्च हि ibid, 1.2.28; ibid, 2.1.26; ibid, 3.2.23-24.
6. अणोरणीयान् महतो महीयानात्मास्य जन्तोर्निहितो गुहायाम् । तमक्रतुः पश्यति वीतशोको धातुप्रसादान्महिमानमात्मनः ।। आसीनो दूरं व्रजति शयानो याति सर्वतः 1 कस्तं मदामदं देवं मदन्यो ज्ञातुमर्हति ।। *Kaṭhopaniṣad* 1.2.20-21; अपाणिपादो जवनो ग्रहीता पश्यत्यचक्षुः स शृणोत्यकर्णः । स वेत्ति वेद्यं न च तस्यास्ति वेत्ता तमाहुरग्र्यं पुरुषं पुराणम् ।। *Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad* 2.19; ibid, 6.19; यद्वेव सम प्लुषिणा समो मशकेन समो नागेन सम एभिस्त्रिभिर्लोकैः, समोऽनेन सर्वेण तस्माद्वेव साम । *Bṛhadāraṇyka Upaniṣad* 1.3,22; एवं वा अरेऽयमात्मानन्तरोऽबाह्य ibid, 4.5 13; Cf. also सर्वेन्द्रियगुणाभासं सर्वेन्द्रियविवर्जितम् । असक्तं सर्वभृच्चैव निर्गुणं गुणभोक्तृ च ।। *Bhogvadgītā* 13.14.

them, or to remove the alleged contradiction,[1] so that, no single word of the śruti is violated.[2] It is only in the above background that the non-dual or the attributeless Brahman is said first, to assume the form of attributes (or qualities), and, afterwards, to transform itself into the created universe (prapañca) through the process of creation.[3]

Thus, in the theory of creation, the Brahman is extolled as the place, the agent, the source, the owner, the receiver, the various objects, the method, the time, the Lord of matter (i. e. Pradhāna) and spirit (Puruṣa),[4] as all the effects of the guṇas (sattva etc.) beginning with Mahat and ending with Paramaṇus, as the attributes viz., jāti, guṇa, viśeṣa, samavāya etc. as well as the six modes of existence viz., production (utpatti), continuation (sthiti), growth (vṛddhi), change (pariṇāma), decay (apakṣaya) and destruction (nāśa).[5]

The Brahman as cause[6] inheres in the universe which consists of the manifestation of His three phases or parts (aṁśas) viz., (1) the material creation (jaḍa jagat), (2) the souls and (3) the Inner Controller (antaryāmin)—as Being (sat), Knowledge (cit) and Bliss (ānanda) respectively.[7]

Vallabhācārya 'says that this manifestation of the three aspects[8] of the Lord in this three-fold creation must be admitted, because it is like the admission of the different degrees of Being which are actually admitted by all people even in the variety of the forms and functions of ghaṭas (water-pots) which all, ordinarily manifest only one aspect of Brahman, viz., that of *Astitva* (being) and because the other two aspects of *Bhāna* and *Priyatva* (appearance and dearness) are perceived by everyone even in the inanimate world (*jaḍe api*). Here, also, the will of the Lord is the regulator'.[1]

---

[1] The fact of the Brahman possessing the above apparently contradictory characteristics is for the glory of Brahman. Cf. *Aṇubhāṣya* 1.1.3.

[2] *Aṇubhāṣya* 3.2 29; *Brahmasūtra* 3.2.27.

[3] Ibid.

[4] यत्र येन यतो यस्य यस्मै यद् यद् यथा यदा । स्यादिदं भगवान् साक्षात्प्रधानपुरुषेश्वरः ॥ *Tattvadīpanibandha* 1.69.

[5] *Tattvadīpanibandhaprakāśa* 2.84.

[6] तत्र किं समवायि निमित्तं कर्तृ वा ।....मृदादिसाधारण्यं च स्यात् । *Aṇubhāṣya* 1.1.3.

[7] अस्तिभातिप्रियत्वेन सच्चिदानन्दरूपेणान्वयात् ibid.

[8] सत्यं ज्ञानमनन्तमानन्दं ब्रह्म *Sarvopaniṣad* 3; चिद्घनानन्दैकरूपम् *Gopīcandanopaniṣad* 5;

The creative emanation of both the inanimate matter as well as the conscious souls[2] from the omnipresent Brahman on account of His desire for sport has been described through the common scriptural image[3] of the sparks coming out of fire.[4]

The universe is created by the Lord due to His power (i. e. that of manifestation or āvirbhāva as explained in the preceding section).[5]

सत्यं ज्ञानमनन्तं ब्रह्म *Taittirīya Upaniṣad* 5.3; विज्ञानमानन्द ब्रह्म *Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad* 3.9.28; आनन्दं ब्राह्मणो विद्वान् *Taittirīya Upaniṣad* 2.9.1; आनन्दो ब्रह्मेति व्यजानादानन्दाद्धि भूतानि जायन्त आनन्देन जातानि जीवन्ति आनन्दं प्रयन्ति । ibid, 3.6.

[1] See English Translation of *Aṇubhāṣya* 1.1.3 by Dr B M. Dhruva in *An Introduction to the Śuddhādvaita School of Philosophy of Śrī Vallabhācārya*, p. 41.

[2] (i) The emanation of the soul like a spark is not (strictly speaking) creation due to the absence of relation with names and forms. Cf. विस्फुलिङ्गवदुच्चरणं नोत्पत्तिः नामरूपसम्बन्धाभावात् *Aṇubhāṣya* 2.3.17.

(ii) The souls are formless (nirākāra) because the phase of bliss (ānanda) forming their essence (as pointed to above) is a latent rather than manifest character. Cf. *Tattvadīpanibandha* 127-130. (See *An Introduction to the Śuddhādvaita School of Philosophy of Śrī Vallabhācārya* p. 58 for an English translation of ibid.)

[3] यथाग्नेर्ज्वलतः सर्वा दिशो विस्फुलिङ्गा विप्रतिष्ठेरन् *Kauśītakyupaniṣad* 3.3; ibid 4.20.

[4] *Aṇubhāṣya* 2.3.43; ibid 2.3.17.

[5] प्रपञ्चो भगवत्कार्यस्तद्रूपो माययाऽभवत् । *Tattvadīpanibandha* 1.23. The ordinary world of experience (saṁsāra) of the jīva is admitted due to the power of ignorance (avidyā, of the Lord. Cf. तच्छक्त्याऽविद्यया त्वस्य जीवसंसार उच्यते ibid.

Through the act of creation which consists in the concealment of the attributes of Bliss and Consciousness the Lord[1] creates the universe in diverse ways[2] : (1) directly from Himself as propounded in the scriptures, (2) through the Puruṣa or Brahman as in the Purāṇas, (3) through His four-fold forms (vyūhas) as in the Pāñcarātra school, (4) through immediately becoming all the creation without any activity on His part and, (5) through creating the realities of the dream existence for the jīvas like a magician.

That the creation pertains to both name and form (*nāmarupe*) according to the Upaniṣads is well-known in the Vedānta. While the creation of forms has been dealt with by all the prominent exponents of the Vedānta, that of name has received unique emphasis by Vallabha only. According to him, the Lord also makes the sport of names as part of the universal creation.[3]

Thus, according to Vallabhācārya, when the Brahman wishes to be many[4] for mere sport (līlā) during the process of creation He uses the power of manifestation (āvirbhāvaśakti), and when, He wishes to sum up the universe within Himself during the process of dissolution, He uses the power of disappearance (tirobhāvaśakti).[5]

---

[1] The pure or attributeless Brahman is the creator or the agent of creation. *Aṇubhāṣya* 1.1.2; न चारोपन्यायेन वक्तुं शक्यम् । तथा मत्यन्यस्य स्यात् ।....ibid; *Tattvadīpanibandha* 1 27; गुणातीतमेव कर्तृ *Aṇubhāṣya* 1.1.5.

[2] *Tattvadīpanibandha* 1.36-39.

[3] नामलीलाया अपि न पृथङ् निरूपणं प्रपञ्चमध्यपातात् *Aṇubhāṣya* 1.1.2; *Tattvadīpanibandha* 1.65-69.

[4] Cf. *Chāndogyopaniṣad*. 7 26.1.

[5] अनन्तमूर्त्ति तद्ब्रह्म कूटस्थं चलमेव च । विरुद्धसर्वधर्माणामाश्रयं युक्त्यगोचरम् ॥ आविर्भावतिरोभावैर्मोहनं बहुरूपतः । इन्द्रियाणां तु सामर्थ्याददृश्यं स्वेच्छया तु तत् । *Tattvadīpanibandha* 1.71, 72.

(C) *The Purpose of Creation*

Brahman sometimes sports within Himself[1] after withdrawing the created universe[2] and this is known as the process of dissolution, and, also, sometimes He sports with pleasure in the *prapañca* i. e., the created universe (after creating or expanding it) and this is known as the process of creation.[3]

Thus, Vallabha, bowing down to the Lord, the Worker of miraculous deeds, from Whom proceeds and Who sports as, the universe with all the (created) differences of names and forms,[4] also indicates that the Lord's (i. e. Brahman's) sportive act of creation is independent (swādhīna).[5] The fact of Brahman being omniscient and omnipotent can be proved only if He is the uncontrolled independent agent of the world.[6] The Brahman's capacity to become all proves His supreme incomprehensible greatness.[7] It is clear from the above that the creatorship of Brahman which is a real fact,[8] is due to His fundamental Will for sports only[9] according to the theory of creation in this school.

Then, it may not be out of place to mention here, that, according to the Vāllabha school, the Lord creates the laws and rules regard-

---

1. कदाचिद्रमते स्वस्मिन् प्रपञ्चेऽपि क्वचित्सुखम् । *Tattvadīpanibandha* 1.68.
2. *Tattvadīpanibandhaprakāśa* 1.68.
3. See f.n. 1 above.
4. नमो भगवते तस्मै कृष्णायाद्भुतकर्मणे । रूपनामविभेदेन जगत् क्रीडति यो यतः । *Tattvadīpanibandha* 1.1.
5. ibid; कर्ता स्वतन्त्र एव स्यात् ibid 1.77; स्वातन्त्र्याभावेन सगुणस्य कर्तृत्वायोगात् *Aṇubhāṣya* 1.1.5.
6. तस्मात् सर्वज्ञत्वं सर्वशक्तिमत्त्वं च सिद्धं निरङ्कुशजगत्कर्तृत्वेन *Aṇubhāṣya* 1.1.2.
7. सर्वभावसमर्थत्वादचिन्त्यैश्वर्यवद् बृहद् । ibid.
8. Cf. वीक्षा अभूत्सती *Tattvadīpanibandha* 1 27.
9. *Brahmasūtra* 2.1.33; Cf. also *Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad* 1.4.3.

ing good and bad actions and their rewards and punishments, and the souls who are concerned with these laws are willed to be so by the Lord Himself. He wills to have the *maryādāmārga*[1] (path of limitations), and, therefore, the dissimilarities in happiness or unhappiness of the created universe are not unreasonably partial or cruel in the context of the purpose of creation as propounded in this school.[2]

VIII. Conclusion

After the above critical and systematic study of the salient features of the theory of creation according to the prominent *ācāryas* (authorities) of the Vedānta we may conclude this chapter by making the following general observations :

(a) The approach towards the fundamental problem of reality or existence of the different ācāryas, inevitably and overwhelmingly shapes the theories of creation in their respective schools. Thus :

(i) According to Śaṅkara, the only reality or the Brahman has no forms or qualities and the appearance of the manifold conscious and unconscious beings is only illusory due to the power of māyā by way of the super-imposition of the effects upon the cause which alone is real from the viewpoint of absolute non-dualism (*kevalādvaita*). Thus, the so-called created universe being simply unreal, there cannot be any transformation (pariṇāma) according to this school's theory of creation.

---

[1] But, some souls are created under this very krīḍā or līlā, as solely dependent on the grace of the Lord, who are not governed by this *maryādāmārga*. Cf. *Vidvanmaṇḍana* by Viṭṭhalanātha, p. 164.

[2] Cf *An Introduction to the Śuddhādvaita School of Philosophy of Śrī Vallabhācārya* p 46.

(ii) According to Bhāskara's viewpoint of identity-in-difference (*bhedābheda*), the ultimate reality or Brahman as the conscious agent or instrumental cause transforms Himself as the material cause into the manifold effects of the created universe due to His very nature or inherent powers. Thus, the effects come into being through the process of a real transformation (pariṇāma) of and by, the essentially non-different sole reality viz., the Brahman, according to the theory of creation in this school.

(iii) According to Rāmānuja's viewpoint of qualified non-dualism (*viśiṣṭādvaita*), although the ultimate principle or reality (i. e. Brahman) essentially always retains His identity, yet, all the same, He has forms viz., those of the conscious and the unconscious beings, which get manifested during the gross state of creation, and remain unmanifest during their causal or minute state of dissolution. The manifest universe has, thus, no independent existence and is accepted only as forming the body and modes or attributes of the non-dual Brahman. This is why, transformation (pariṇāma) pertains to the state or avasthā (i. e. from the gross to the unmanifest and *vice versa*) of the infinite modes or characteristics (in the form of the abovementioned conscious and unconscious beings) of the sole reality (viz., Brahman) according to the theory of creation in this school.

(iv) According to Nimbārka's viewpoint of mutual distinctness and non-difference (*dvoitādvaita*), although (1) the Paramātman (or Brahman), (2) the individual self, and (3) the material universe form distinct categories of reality due to their respective different attributes, yet, (2) and (3) (i. e. the jīva and the jaḍa) are non-different from (1) due to the former's dependence on the latter in respect of their existence and activity etc. Thus, the existing universe with forms is a transformation (pariṇāma) of the Brahman as its material cause, in which the former remains without manifestation (i. e. without the so-called existence, activity etc.) prior to the creation. Also, the above pariṇāma has been defined as nothing but the power of ejection belonging to the Paramātman, according to this school.

(v) According to Madhva's viewpoint of absolute dualism (*kevaladvaita*), unconscious matter (Prakṛti), souls (jīvas) and the Supreme Lord (Paramātman) etc. exist as distinct realities of the universe having their own respective attributes. Theory of creation or production of an effect, in this school, therefore, envisages a real transformation (pariṇāma) both in respect of (1) the attributes or qualities (dharmas) as well as in that of (2) the qualified (dharmins) as the case may be. The Lord is only the conscious efficient cause (just like the potter required in the production of the jar, for example), and the prakṛti (forming His body being controlled by Him) alone is modified as the material cause. Thus, creation according to this school is a real or metaphysical fact originating from the material causality of Prakṛti (or māyā) subservient to the Will of God.

(vi) According to Vallabha's viewpoint of the non-dualism of reality which is free from illusoriness or māyā (i. e. unreality) and, hence, known as *śuddhādvaita* –the jīva and the jaḍa as the effects, are essentially identical with their cause, viz., Brahman, but, in the jīvadaśā and jaḍadaśā they respectively have their quality of bliss and those of bliss and intelligence concealed or obscured (tirohita). Creation implies only the process of limited manifestation (āvirbhāva) and disappearance (tirobhāva) of the three real aspects or aṁśas of the Lord or Brahman.

(b) Somehow, the conscious[1] eternal creator having supreme energy or omnipotence, omniscience, omnipresence et cetera is universally (though with varying emphasis and degree in each school) accepted as having a significant role in the theory of creation of all these schools. Also, orthodox theism especially in its later developments of the devotion (bhakti) movement seems to have deeply influenced the concept and role of God in the general theory of creation as propounded in the Vedānta. Thus :

(i) Even Sāṅkaravedānta accepts the power or energy in the form of avidyā or māyā, which, from the practical level of created existence, makes possible the appearance of the manifold names and forms upon the basically pure, unconditioned and absolute Brahman.

(ii) The Bhāskara school even divides these unthinkable and infinite śaktis inherent in Brahman, into two kinds each being held responsible for the creations of the animate as well as inanimate beings respectively, from and by Him. God is, thus, recognised as both the material and the efficient cause of creation.

(iii) Then, Rāmānuja is well-known for being a staunch believer in the real and infinite auspicious attributes of such a Creator God, Who is ever qualified by both the inanimate and animate beings of the created universe in a manifest or gross state during creation, and in an unmanifest state before creation (i. e. during the period of dissolution). His school contributes to the better applicability or understanding of the role of Brahman or God by postulating the permanent existence of effects as His actual characteristics or modes on the analogy of the worldly objects (e. g. the mode of redness etc. in the jar is ever present with the jar which it qualifies).

---

[1] The 'desire' or 'will' factor is self-evident in such a conscious or intelligent principle (*tattva*).

(iv) Then, the Nimbārka school quite appealingly and interestingly believes God to possess the qualities of jñāna, śakti, bala, aiśvarya, tejas and vīrya for being able to play His extraordinary and complex role in accordance with the theory of creation propounded in the Vedānta. Above all, this school emphasizes the dependence of all existence and activity in the universe upon Him, and the fact of the unobstructability of His Will.

(v) The Mādhva school accepts God as being the conscious instrumental cause, as being omnipotent and omniscient, and also as having an unobstructed will. But, He is only the supervisor of the phenomenon of creation, subsistence and destruction materially taking place in the unconscious matter (i. e. the prakṛti) as well as in the souls (i. e. the jīvas). The most distinctive contribution of this school, however, in respect of the role of Brahman or God in the theory of creation, is the explanation or illustration of the special relationship between God's desire and the transformations (pariṇāmas) of Prakṛti in the process of creation, on the analogy of that between the desire of a conscious being and the bodily responses (e. g. the movement of the feet etc.) controlled by Him.

(vi) The Vāllabha school of Vedānta, while accepting Brahman or God as both the efficient and material cause of creation, emphasizes the purity i. e. the non-illusoriness or reality of the created beings (in sharp contrast to the extreme viewpoint of the Śāṅkara school of Vedānta) in comparison to their common cause viz., Brahman or God. Further, the the-

> ory of creation, here remarkably establishes a personal God, Who, having the three 'all-embracing' (if we may use the term) oft-repeated scriptural aspects of existence (sat), consciousness or intelligence (cit) and bliss (ānanda), ever manifests and obscures or conceals His aspects in the infinite ways and degrees even like the Sun spreading and withdrawing his rays in our day-to-day experience. All the created beings, including the prakṛti and the puruṣas etc. are as much inherent or related to their original cause (viz., the God) as the light is to the Sun. It is only in this school of Vedānta, that we find the reality of the phenomenal existence or the created universe brilliantly reconciled to the all-pervasiveness and immutability of the creator God or Brahman.

(c) The purpose of creation in respect of the jīvas, is to make possible the experience of pleasure and pain et cetera accruing from their beginningless adṛṣṭa or destiny, in accordance with the well-known orthodox Indian doctrine of the law of Karman. The motive behind the Brahman's or God's activity or role in the theory of creation as propounded by the different schools of the Vedānta, is none else than mere sport or playfulness.

(d) We find that the different schools of the Vedānta attach paramount importance to a systematic approach and synthetic interpretation of the statements found in the Vedic scriptures (i. e. the Vedas) and allied or traditional literature (viz., that of the smṛti, purāṇa, itihāsa etc.) based on them (especially the three *Prasthānas* as have been mentioned at the beginning of this chapter) which they hold as unassailable and having highest authenticity. In this respect (cf. the regard in which the Pūrvamīmāṁsakas hold the Vedas and the sacrificial rites enjoined in them) and with special reference to the theory of creation the Vedānta is undoubtedly far more orthodox or conservative than the other similar schools of Indian Philosophy.

(e) The normal orthodox concepts regarding the cyclic order and periodicity of creation and dissolution as well as the general similarity in the names of the regions, the different classes of living beings (including the gods etc.) and the inert material objects of the universe during each period of their created existence, are duly accepted in the Vedānta.

(f) The Vedānta, like any other orthodox school of Indian Philosophy, is characteristically concerned with the fundamental problem of the nature of the ultimate reality, and more so with that of the achievement of highest or absolute (cf. the inclination of the ācāryas of the Vedānta towards non-dualism or some form of unity or harmony in the universe as a whole) knowledge from the spiritual or religious viewpoint, than with a detailed analysis of the physical matter-of-fact universe (cf. the theory of creation in the Nyāyavaiśeṣika in this regard), or with finding the simple 'status-quo' basis for our common or mundane secular as well as religious performances (cf. the theory of creation in the Pūrvamīmāṁsā in this regard), or with postulating a purely intellectual and largely atheistic[1] (and, hence, unpalatable to the predominantly religious populace of the orthodox Indians) solution of the problem of creation. It is in the above background, that, we can appreciate the theory of creation in the Vedānta in its true perspective.

(g) The Vedānta (especially that of the Śāṅkara school) can justifiably, perhaps, claim to represent the highest state of the spiritual advancement of an enquirer of the ultimate truth or knowledge, and as such, its theory of creation—based on the perfect serenity of the idealistic non-dualism, or even on the divine harmony and rather quiet or intimate relationship among the manifold realities of the universe throughout the various stages of their existence on the other hand—may also call for our highest estimation.

---

[1] Cf. the theory of creation in the Sāṅkhyayoga in this regard.

8

CONCLUSION

After having critically dealt with the theory of creation in main orthodox schools of Indian Philosophy in the unique background of the Saṁhitās and the Upaniṣads, we may conclude our study by making a few general remarks on the theory of creation as revealed in the orthodox Indian philosophy as a whole.

I. The Concepts of Knowledge and Reality Involved in the Theor of Creation in Main Orthodox Schools of Indian Philosophy

Direct realization (*aparokṣānubhūti*) based on the complete knowledge of the phenomenon of creation—so intimately connected with the concept of reality as a whole - is not only universal but one and the same. It will, therefore, be quite helpful to acquaint ourselves with the concept of this highest or essential (i. e. tāttvika or that 'pertaining to reality') knowledge (jñāna) according to the main orthodox schools of Indian philosophy. Thus, as already noted by us, the Vedic[1] Ṛṣis had 'seen'[2] the truth or the essence of reality as a single phenomenon, and then propounded the various theories of creation based on its different visions.

In this context it may be interesting to note, in the words of Mahāmahopādhyāya Dr. Gopinath Kaviraj, that 'the prime characteristic of this super-sensuous knowledge is . . . .its immediacy and intense clarity. According to all the systems such knowledge is considered transcendental, being held to be free from the time and space limitations which are imposed as a matter of necessity on all inferior knowledge and from the indispensable conditions which govern the origin or the manifestation of the latter. . . . . This higher knowledge dispenses, in its rise, with the need of sense organs, and unlike reflective judgement, with that of the rational faculty. It reveals the past and the future as in a single flash, and also the absent and the remote. Nothing escapes its searching sight. It is aptly described as simultaneously illuminating everything in every aspect and as eternal (Yogasūtra III. 84).'[3] Dr. Kaviraj has also most convincingly demonstrated and analytically described how this supreme knowledge, called variously by the names of ārṣajñāna, pratibhā, prajñā et cetera has been acknowledged and referred to not only in the orthodox schools of

---

1. Faith in the Veda and the traditional literature inspired by it is a significant feature of orthodox Indian thought in general. Cf., for example, स सर्वोऽभिहितो वेदे सर्वज्ञानमयो हि सः *Manusmṛti* 2.7; श्रुतिस्तु वेदो विज्ञेयो धर्मशास्त्रं तु वै स्मृतिः । ते सर्वार्थेष्वमीमांस्ये ताभ्यां धर्मो हि निर्बभौ । योऽवमन्यते ते मूले हेतुशास्त्राश्रयाद् द्विजः । स साधुभिर्बहिष्कार्यो नास्तिको वेदनिन्दकः । ibid 2.10-11.
2. Cf., for example, the well-known instance of the imparting of the divine eye (divya cakṣu) by the Lord to Arjuna for 'seeing' (cf. the concept of Ṛṣis as seers in popular faith) His universal or 'all-in-one' form (i. e. for viśvarūpadarśana) in the *Bhagavadgītā* (chapter XI).
3. *Aspects of Indian Thought* p. 2.

Indian philosophy such as the Nyāyavaiśeṣika, the Yoga, the Vedānta and the Pūrvamīmāṁsā, but, also, in the traditional literature of itihāsa, purāṇa et cetera as well. Even the science of grammar, the āgamas (i.e. the *śaiva* and *śākta* schools of orthodox Indian philosophy) and the Buddhist and Jain schools of Indian philosophy have been shown to have accepted the above concept in their own way.[1] In fact the rise of this knowledge signals omniscience itself which, again, is possible of being attained by the mystic or yogin who becomes the very ideal of perfect Humanity or Divinity in the highest plane of cosmic life.[2]

It is in the above background alone that the differences existing among the theories of creation in the main orthodox schools of Indian philosophy may be synthesized as mere representations of the (often 'apparently-opposed-to-each-other') various stages in the spiritual advancement of the enquiry of truth or reality for the supreme or ultimate knowledge of the one phenomenon of creation.

II. The Different Theories Being Based on the Concept of Adhikārabheda in Fact Point to the One Integral Phenomenon of Creation[3]

Also, the orthodox concept of difference pertaining to gradation or classification (adhikārabheda) among the enquirers of truth seeking enlightenment or perfection, as higher and lower, is a clear indication of the appreciation[4] of the utility and graspability of a particular viewpoint, aspect or vision of reality alone for a particular section of society.[1] Accordingly, we find that the main orthodox schools of Indian philosophy present mainly three theories of creation viz. :

---

[1] *Aspects of Indian Thought* by Dr. G. N. Kaviraj, pp. 3-41.

[2] Ibid, pp. 41-44.

[3] ओम् पूर्णमदः पूर्णमिदं पूर्णात्पूर्णमुदच्यते । पूर्णस्य पूर्णमादाय पूर्णमेवावशिष्यते ॥ *Śāntipāṭha* to *Iśopaniṣad*; मृत्योः स मृत्युमाप्नोति य इह नानेव पश्यति *Kaṭhopaniṣad* 2.1.10.

[4] प्रकृतेर्गुणसंमूढाः सज्जन्ते गुणकर्मसु । तानकृत्स्नविदो मन्दान्कृत्स्नविन्न विचालयेत् ॥ *Bhagavad-gītā* 3.29; न हि ज्ञानेन सदृशं पवित्रमिह विद्यते । तत्स्वयं योगसंसिद्धः कालेनात्मनि विन्दति ॥ ibid 4.38; अज्ञानेनावृतं ज्ञानं तेन मुह्यन्ति जन्तवः । ibid 5.15; विद्यां चाविद्यां च यस्तद्वेदो-

(1) that of ārambha (such as in the Nyāyavaiśeṣika) at the lowest or gross plane.

(2) that of pariṇāma (such as in the Sāṅkhyayoga, for example) at the intermediate or minute plane.

(3) that of vivarta (such as in the Śāṅkaravedānta) on the highest or causal plane.

These theories are based respectively on (1) the practical or material, (2) the apparent or intellectual and (3) the transcendental or pure aspects or visions of existence or reality.

III. The Concepts of Time and Space as General Background

The vastness of space and time[2] forms a common background in the theory of creation in the main orthodox schools of Indian philo-

---

भयं सह । अविद्यया मृत्युं तीर्त्वा विद्ययाऽमृतमश्नुते ॥ *Īśopaniṣad* 11; हिरण्मयेन पात्रेण सत्यस्यापिहितं मुखम् । तत्त्वं पूषन्नपावृणु सत्यधर्माय दृष्टये ॥ ibid 15; न तत्र चक्षुर्गच्छति न वाग्गच्छति नो मनो न विद्मो न विजानीमो यथैतदनुशिष्यादन्यदेव तद्विदितादथो अविदितादधि । इति शुश्रुम पूर्वेषां ये नस्तद्व्याचचक्षिरे ॥ *Kenopaniṣad* 3; कुलं पवित्रं जननी कृतार्था वसुन्धरा पुण्यवती च तेन । अपारसच्चित्सुखसागरेऽस्मिल्लीनं परे ब्रह्मणि यस्य चेतः ॥ *Vedāntasiddhāntamuktāvalī*; उत्तिष्ठत जाग्रत प्राप्य वरान्निबोधत । क्षुरस्य धारा निशिता दुरत्यया दुर्गं पथस्तत्कवयो वदन्ति ॥ *Kaṭhopaniṣad* 1.3.14; एष सर्वेपु भूतेपु गूढोत्मा न प्रकाशते । दृश्यते त्वग्र्या बुद्ध्या सूक्ष्मया सूक्ष्मदर्शिभिः ibid, 1.3.12; श्रवणायापि बहुभिर्यो न लभ्यः शृण्वन्तोऽपि बहवो यं न विद्युः आश्चर्यो वक्ता कुशलोऽस्य लब्धाश्चर्यो ज्ञाता कुशलानुशिष्टः ॥ ibid, 1.2.7.

1. Cf. Introduction to *Prasthānatrayaprakāśikā* by Paṇḍita Kāśīnātha Jhā—written by Mahāmahopādhyāya Dr. Gopīnātha Kavirāja.
2. Thus, these are also known as the common causes (sādhāraṇa kāraṇas) for all products. Cf. *Tarkabhāṣā* by Keśavamiśra, p. 23.

sophy. The concept of the universe (brahmāṇḍa) as constituted by the various regions situated higher and lower in terms of space, and the concept of fixed and equal duration of the periods of each creation as well as that of the following destruction of the universe or cosmos from the viewpoint of the concept of time are remarkable in this context. Also, it is due to the unthinkable ubiquitousness of time and space, that, on the one hand, the cycle of creation (jagatprapañca) has been understandably conceived as beginningless from the causal aspect and on the other, the phenomenon of individual creation has been held as coming to exist again and again within their limits and, hence, also as non-eternal from the aspect of each created universe as an effect.

The process of each creation and dissolution, therefore, involves only limited time (Cf. the notions of the past, the present, and the future in this regard) and finite regions (lokas) as necessary background of the existence of the material objects of the universe as well as the activity of the conscious beings.

IV. *The Concept of the Created Universe as a Moral Stage Involving the Important Role of the Law of Karman*

The law of Karman, which sets forth, that, the actions of the conscious beings (jīvas), whether good or bad, must produce[1] their proper consequences during their life or continued existence throghout the beginningless series of births and deaths,[2] provided these acts are done

---

1. Cf. the concept of every gross object or happening of the phenomenal world presupposing invariably antecedent causal factors behind it in all the main orthodox schools of Indian Philosophy.
2. Cf. the concept of transmigration or punarjanma as a distinct feature of all the orthodox schools of Indian Philosophy. Cf., for example, वासांसि जीर्णानि यथा विहाय नवानि गृह्णाति नरोऽपराणि । तथा शरीराणि विहाय जीर्णान्यन्यानि संयाति नवानि

with a desire[1] for obtaining the fruits thereof, is universally acknowledged as a pertinent and basic fact by the Veda,[2] as well as the main orthodox schools of Indian philosophy.[3]

The fact of Karmans producing due experience of pleasure and pain is most commonly explained on the popular image of sowing good or bad seeds, which, in effect, cause correspondingly good or bad crops. Again, the threefold division of the Karmans as accumulated (*sañcita*), as those being consumed or having begun to produce the experiences of the present birth as a whole (*prārabdha*) and as those as are actually in the process of being performed in the present (*kriyamāṇa*) respectively, could have, also, been symbolically suggested by the popular image of the seeds or grains stored, those being consumed, and those only being sown in the fields. The unseen force of merit and demerit is held, either to directly guide the process of production right from the first products like dvyaṇuka, or, at least, determine the pleasurability et cetera of the material objects of the universe. Thus, the orthodox law of Karman wonderfully suffices for a just and moral atmosphere in the created universe by making each jīva to be responsible for his good or bad experience (*sukhaduḥkhabhoga*) as well as his gradual uplift leading ultimately to complete liberation from misery.

देही ।। *Bhagavadgītā*, 2.22; Ibid, 2.27 etc. Cf. also *Ṛgveda* 4.26.27 etc. Again it is interesting to note that all the main orthodox schools of Indian Philosophy also believe in the eternality and, hence, the immortality of the conscious beings or souls.

1. Cf. यस्य सर्वे समारम्भाः कामसंकल्पवर्जिताः । ज्ञानाग्निदग्धकर्माणं तमाहुः पण्डितं बुधाः । *Bhagavadgītā* 4.19.

2. मा वो भुजेमान्यजातमेनो *Ṛgveda* 7.52.2; Cf. Ibid. 6.51.7; ऋतं पिबन्तौ सुकृतस्य लोके *Kaṭhopaniṣad* 1.3.1.

3. Cf. the denotations like dharmādharma or puṇya and pāpa adṛṣṭa, apūrva, karmavipāka and maryādāmārga et cetera in this context.

In this way, the purpose of creation is easily shown to be as the good of the jīvas in the main orthodox schools of Indian philosophy. The role of the law of Karman, truly, therefore, is also called as very mysterious or unknown,[1] because, the conscious beings (e. g. we human beings, too) do not normally know or expect what is really going to happen or face them often all-of-a-sudden in the mundane life, being ignorant of their individual past deeds[2] in so many births.

V. The Concept and Role of God

The concept of God, too, generally speaking adds much to the credibility and viability of the complex and manifold process of universal creation and destruction in the theory of creation according to the main orthodox schools of Indian philosophy. Thus, He is said to be the independent conscious agent causing and controlling the process of transformation or evolution in the inert primordial matter (prakṛti), and to be beyond the limits of time and space which invariably condition the created beings viz., both the conscious ones (i. e. the jīvas) and the unconscious ones (i. e. the jaḍa). The powers (śaktis) of God are mainly threefold viz., those of knowledge (jñānaśakti), will (icchāśakti) and action (kriyāśakti). In other words, the causal operation implied by such a theory of creation makes it imperative for us to accept the role of an eternal, omniscient and omnipotent Supreme Being. The latter's relationship with the Prakṛti and its later manifestations (nay even time and space) are variously explained as the one subsisting between the jīva and his body, or as that between a father and his son, or as that between the very qualities or modes of a thing and the thing itself, and so on and

---

1. किं कर्म किमकर्मेति कवयोऽप्यत्र मोहिताः । *Bhagavadgītā* 4.16; कर्मणो ह्यपि बोद्धव्यं बोद्धव्यं च विकर्मणः । अकर्मणश्च बोद्धव्यं गहना कर्मणो गतिः ॥ Ibid, 4.17.
2. Cf. न हि कश्चित्क्षणमपि जातु तिष्ठत्यकर्मकृत् । कार्यते ह्यवशः कर्म सर्वः प्रकृतिजैर्गुणैः । *Bhagavadgītā* 3.5.

so forth, according to the different viewpoints of the schools. Thus, the theory of creation is given a personal or (in a loose sense) even human colour by the above-mentioned concept and role of God, Who is either the sole (i. e. both the material as well as the efficient), or, at least, the necessary instrumental cause operative behind the process of creation.

राष्ट्रीय संस्कृत संस्थान
जयपुर परिसर, जयपुर
पुस्तकालय
क्रमांक... 14213